



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600005536P

29

566.



1

64

S
A

14.1829.

SECOND ENQUIRY

INTO

THE GROUNDS

ON WHICH

THE PROPHETIC PERIOD

OF

Daniel and St. John,

HAS BEEN

SUPPOSED TO CONSIST OF 1260 YEARS,

CONTAINING

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ARGUMENTS OF MEDE—REMARKS ON A
PASSAGE IN THE DIALOGUES ON PROPHECY,—ON VARIOUS
REVIEWS OF THE FIRST ENQUIRY,—AND ON THE COMMON
INTERPRETATION OF THE SEVEN HEADS OF THE BEAST.

BY

S. R. MAITLAND.



LONDON:

C. AND J. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND
WATERLOO-PLACE;

STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER;
JEW, GLOUCESTER.

1829.

566.

PREFACE.

This second Enquiry is intended to meet some observations which have been made on the first; and I have adopted the arrangement in which its several parts will be found, for reasons which I will briefly state. The Examination of Mede's Arguments has been placed first, because it will make the reader who is not familiar with the subject, acquainted with the "reasons" which that writer considered as "clearly demonstrating" that the 1260 days are not to be understood as literal days—the passage in the Dialogues on Prophecy contains, I believe, no new argument; but consists chiefly of a collection of authorities in support of the mystical interpretation—in the Remarks on the Review in the Christian Observer, I have endeavoured to meet some arguments

which the Reviewer considers as having been hitherto inadequately noticed—in those on a Review in the Christian Examiner, I have merely attempted to clear myself from what has appeared to the Reviewer to be a culpable omission in my former Enquiry—these are followed by some Remarks on a Review in the Christian Guardian, in which, on the suggestion of the Reviewer, I have stated, as briefly as I could, some considerations which appear to me to furnish direct^a evidence against the mystical interpretation—to these are added some observations on the common interpretation of the seven heads of the Beast, which are intended as a specimen of the more detailed examination to which it is proposed to submit the various parts of the system.

In this, as well as in my former, Enquiry, I have endeavoured to keep to the single question which I proposed—namely, whether the 1260 days are *literal days*, or *years*—and when, in pursuance of this object, I have noticed the inter-

^a I observe that in the section referred to I have called it *positive* evidence—I beg the reader to understand that I only used the word as opposed to *negative*.

pretation of any particular part of the prophecy, I have (except where the avowed object was to exhibit their discrepancy) selected those parts in which there is the most agreement among expositors; my design being not so much to impugn the system of any particular writer on the 1260 years, as to investigate that one point, which is the common foundation of all. On this account, I have been prevented from taking specific notice of the "Reply, by a Member of the Church of England;" I say this, merely that I may not appear to pass it over in disrespectful silence; and I think it will be obvious to every reader that the principles of interpretation for which the author contends, may be either adopted, or rejected, without deciding, or very materially affecting, that one single point, which it is my present object to discuss. For the same reason, I have had no opportunity of offering any acknowledgment to one or two Reviews, to which I have made no reference; but whose favourable notice of my former pamphlet has encouraged me in this undertaking.

At the time when my Enquiry was published,

I was not aware that the literal interpretation of the 1260 days had been maintained in a work recently published.^b I mention this, not only that I may offer my thanks to the author, for that and for other works on the subject, for which I am indebted to his kindness; but because, in some parts, the line of argument is so similar to that which I have myself followed, that the readers of that work might reasonably think me guilty of having borrowed from it without acknowledgment.

^b “Hints humbly submitted to Commentators; and more especially to those who have written elaborate Dissertations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John: by William Witherby,” London, 1821. The same view had been previously maintained in “A Review of Scripture, in testimony of the truth of the second Advent, the first Resurrection, and the Millennium, &c. by a Layman”—London, 1818—a work containing many suggestions which I believe to be original, and which certainly well deserve the consideration of the writers on prophecy.

CONTENTS.

	Page
Examination of the Arguments of Mede	1
Remarks on a Passage in the Dialogues on Prophecy,	33
——— on a Review in the Christian Observer.....	47
——— on a Review in the Christian Examiner....	69
——— on a Review in the Christian Guardian.....	73
Note on Bishop Newton.....	137
Remarks on the common interpretation of the seven heads of the Beast.....	147

ERRATA.

P. 12, l. 6, for "his" read "is."
— 37, — 11, — "Venema" — "Venema."
— 113, — 5 from bottom, — "xviii." — "xvii."

,

,

,



A SECOND ENQUIRY, &c.

SINCE the publication of my “Enquiry” I have been asked, by more than one of my clerical brethren, whether I had duly considered the arguments of MEDE in support of the mystical interpretation of the 1260 days? As his name has, and ought to have, great weight with all who are acquainted with his character, and writings; and as the question seems to imply that his argument is either fuller, or more forcibly stated, than Mr. Faber’s, I have thought it right to give it a fresh, and more particular examination.

Mr. Irving, indeed, in his preliminary discourse to the work of Lacunza, has said (p. xxix.) “Now I am not ignorant that there are amongst ourselves men who doubt and disbelieve the interpretation which almost all Protestants give to this period, as containing a term of 1260 years; and that of late a pamphlet has been written by a very worthy clergyman of the Church of England to this effect: but really

“ I have thought this matter so *completely set at rest* by MEDE, and HENRY MORE, and the common consent of those who have written since, as not to need any demonstration. And it is manifest that, if in emblematical visions,* such as those of Daniel and the Apocalypse, you will interpret the periods literally, you may as well interpret the other parts literally, and insist upon literal beasts of the character there set forth, and a literal throne, and so of the rest, which no one will be so foolish as to require.”

I may be “ foolish ” (for such is the misfortune of many “ very worthy ” persons) but I must avow that I do “ interpret the other parts literally, and insist upon literal beasts of the character there set forth, and a literal throne, and so of the rest ; ” and, as far as I can find, most commentators (with Mr. Irving himself I suspect) do the same. Thus when Daniel says

* Strictly speaking the period does not occur in an “ emblematical vision,” but in the *explanation* or *interpretation* of one; and I do not see why *times* may not be *years* in this vision, as much as in the vision of the Tree which Nebuchadnezzar saw. Was not that an emblematical vision? and were not those of Pharoah’s Butler and Baker, and of Pharoah himself, “ emblematical visions?” yet the periods were literal; that is, the days were literal days, though emblematically represented by vine branches and baskets, and the years were literal years, though symbolized by kine.

he saw "*a goat*," I understand the word to mean that "*literal beast*," and nothing else; for who pretends that the prophet meant to express, by that word, more or less than what it implies in its literal and obvious sense? I know that the *goat* which Daniel saw was a *type* or *emblem* of the King of Grecia; but nobody (I believe) understands that he saw, or appeared to see, more or less than a "*literal beast*." Mr. Irving seems to me to argue as he might have done if it were ascertained from some other source of information, that in his vision Daniel had actually seen the King of Grecia, and then had described that vision by saying that he saw "*a goat*." This would certainly be using the word *goat* mystically, and we should be obliged to confess, that he did not mean a "*literal beast*." Undoubtedly the beasts which Daniel saw were *emblematical*, but nothing can be more *literal* than the language in which he has described them; let it only be admitted (and I cannot conceive why it should not) that by the word *day* he means *day*, as much as by the word *goat*, he means *goat*, and all farther argument on my part would be needless. I am not aware that his description of the beasts contains *any one figurative expression*, except we so consider that which relates to the *horn* plucked up by the *roots*; and, his having described *emblematical things*, in *plain words*,

gives no colour for maintaining that in another place he made such an unwonted and mystical use of a word, as that we ought to translate it by another word. Every body I believe agrees that he saw *literal* beasts which were emblematical of other things, and stated to be so. Nobody, as far as I know, has suggested that he spoke of a certain 1260 *days* which were to symbolize a certain 1260 *years*. In short we are here called upon to substitute the word *year* in the text for *day*; is there any other part of the book of Daniel in which we could take the liberty to substitute the name of the thing symbolized, for the word which the prophet uses, without falsifying his meaning?—when Daniel says “four great *beasts* came up from the *sea*” it would be absurd, and would not convey his meaning, if we were to read “four great *empires* arose on the *earth*,” although those beasts were symbolical of four Empires; and this is just because his *language* is *literal*, while he speaks of *things* that were *emblematical*.

Mr. Irving however goes on to say, “And
“ why require it in one part and not in another?
“ The word time, rather than year; and times
“ rather than two years; and the dividing of
“ time rather than half a year; were evidence
“ to me that there was a mystery under it :^b but

^b The reader may find some remarks on this point in the reply to the Review in the Christian Observer.

“ when I find it in the midst of an emblematical “ vision ” [allow me to add—in the midst of plain language, the words of which are by the common consent of interpreters taken in their obvious and literal sense] “ I can have no doubt “ thereof, according to all rules and canons of “ interpretation.”

With regard to the question, “ Why require “ it in one part and not in another ? ” I think I have answered it for myself, by shewing that I do require *words* to be taken according to their *obvious meaning* as it regards the *beasts*, as much as I do with regard to the *periods*; but the inconsistency seems to me to lie on the other side; for as far as I know, except on the one point of the *periods*, Mr. Irving himself would agree with me in taking the words of Daniel according to their obvious meaning.—If he considered the word “ time ” instead of “ year ” in Chap. V. as “ evidence that there was a mystery under it,” why did he not view it in the same light in Chap. IV.; and maintain that the years of Nebuchadnezzar’s banishment were mystical? To be sure there would have been some difficulty in persuading his readers that the King of Babylon was exiled for 2520 years; and yet I think Mr. Irving would hardly have liked to explain the matter as some have done. I cannot help wishing however that, instead of confining his reference to two writers whose

arguments I had *not* quoted, and whose works the greater part of his readers have probably never seen, he had taken some notice of the writer whose arguments I did give at full length, and whose works are much more popular, and accessible to general readers.

It is needless to say that on this occasion I think Mr. Faber the advocate of a bad cause; but that he is an able, and intrepid advocate, the world needs not be told. It is pretty certain that he was not ignorant of what Mede, and Henry More, and his other predecessors had said upon the subject; and I really thought that in taking the argument as stated by him, I was meeting it in it's strongest form; and that by printing it at full length in his own words, I was doing it all the justice in my power. It was natural to suppose that a person of Mr. Faber's ability and practice, as a controversial writer, would state the argument to the best advantage, and indeed I think he has done so; but as the name of MEDE stands so high, and he has been mentioned by others beside Mr. Irving, I shall be obliged to any reader who will go with me through his arguments, and a few remarks upon them. As to the arguments of Henry More, I must say that I do not think them worth a particular examination. It appears to me that whatever they contain, which is not found in the argument as stated

by Mede, or Faber, is so plainly irrelevant, or false, or absurd, as to require no confutation.

I will therefore lay before the reader the argument of Mede, with some observations in reply to it, and will adopt the method which I before pursued with regard to the argument of Mr. Faber—that is, I will set down the whole, replying to each part separately.

“ FIVE REASONS,

“ Clearly demonstrating that the anti-christian or apostatical times are more than three single years and a half.”

- “ I. Because impossible so many things, and of such
 “ quality, as are to be performed in this time, should
 “ be done in three single years and an half—as
- “ 1. Ten kingdoms, founded at the same hour with
 “ the beast. (Ch. xvii.)
 - “ 2. Peoples and multitudes of nations and tongues
 “ to serve and obey him. (Ch. xiii.)
 - “ 3. To make war with the saints, and overcome
 “ them. (Ibid.)
 - “ 4. To cause all that dwell upon the earth to wor-
 “ ship him.
 - “ 5. Babylon to ride the beast so long, that all
 “ nations shall drink the wine of her fornication,
 “ all kings of the earth commit fornication with
 “ her. (Ch. xvii. and xviii.)
 - “ 6. The merchants and all those that had ships in
 “ the sea to grow rich by trading with her. (Ch.
 “ xviii.) These things should ask more than three
 “ years work, or four either.”

In this first reason there are six things mentioned; and the whole objection rests upon the IMPOSSIBILITY of their being performed in three years and a half.

To speak of each separately.

“ 1. Ten kingdoms founded at the same hour with the beast.” Why is it IMPOSSIBLE that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half? Surely it is not unreasonable to ask for something more than dogmatical assertion. If it be said that it is very *improbable*, I reply, that this has nothing to do with the question; and that those who use great words should be prepared to stand by them. It does indeed make all the difference in the world, whether the thing can be shewn to be *impossible*, or whether it is only, in the judgment of mankind, *improbable*. But I am perfectly ready to meet the objection with this qualification; which, I suppose, it absolutely requires. Is it more *improbable* than events which have already occurred in fulfilment of prophecy? And are we to make our judgment of *probability* the test by which prophecy is to be tried, and the rule by which it is to be interpreted? It will be remembered, that this argument rests entirely on the impossibility (I am willing to qualify it into improbability) of performance; and I ask, is it more improbable that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half, than that a

virgin should conceive and bear a child? Is it more improbable than that the world should be drowned by a flood, that Babylon and Nineveh should be blotted out, or that no stone should remain on another in Jerusalem? I apprehend that it would be quite absurd to compare the *probability* of any one of these things, by which the prophecies of scripture have been literally fulfilled, with the probability that ten kingdoms *may be* founded in the course of three years and a half?

What did Napoleon do in *one year and a half*? I will state it in Mr. Frere's words. "The first
 " day of the new year 1806 was distinguished
 " in Germany by an event not a little singular;
 " viz. the coronation of the Electors of Wirtem-
 " berg and Bavaria, *as Kings*; which dignity
 " was further amplified by a considerable in-
 " crease of territory, at the expence of the un-
 " fortunate house of Austria. Again, on the 15th
 " of March, of the *same year*, Murat was invested
 " with the *Duchies* of Berg, and Cleves. * * * * *
 " In the *same year* Holland was *made a Kingdom*,
 " and Louis Buonaparte, a younger brother of
 " Napoleon, was placed upon the throne. In
 " *this year* Saxony also was *erected into a King-*
 " *dom*. We again read that, on the 31st of
 " March, 1806, Buonaparte submitted to the
 " Senate a variety of decrees for it's approba-
 " tion: by one of them he conferred *the King-*

In this first reason there are six things mentioned; and the whole objection rests upon the IMPOSSIBILITY of their being performed in three years and a half.

To speak of each separately.

“ 1. Ten kingdoms founded at the same hour with the beast.” Why is it IMPOSSIBLE that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half? Surely it is not unreasonable to ask for something more than dogmatical assertion. If it be said that it is very *improbable*, I reply, that this has nothing to do with the question; and that those who use great words should be prepared to stand by them. It does indeed make all the difference in the world, whether the thing can be shewn to be *impossible*, or whether it is only, in the judgment of mankind, *improbable*. But I am perfectly ready to meet the objection with this qualification; which, I suppose, it absolutely requires. Is it more *improbable* than events which have already occurred in fulfilment of prophecy? And are we to make our judgment of *probability* the test by which prophecy is to be tried, and the rule by which it is to be interpreted? It will be remembered, that this argument rests entirely on the impossibility (I am willing to qualify it into improbability) of performance; and I ask, is it more improbable that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half, than that a

virgin should conceive and bear a child? Is it more improbable than that the world should be drowned by a flood, that Babylon and Nineveh should be blotted out, or that no stone should remain on another in Jerusalem? I apprehend that it would be quite absurd to compare the *probability* of any one of these things, by which the prophecies of scripture have been literally fulfilled, with the probability that ten kingdoms *may be* founded in the course of three years and a half?

What did Napoleon do in *one year and a half*? I will state it in Mr. Frere's words. "The first
 " day of the new year 1806 was distinguished
 " in Germany by an event not a little singular;
 " viz. the coronation of the Electors of Wirtem-
 " berg and Bavaria, *as Kings*; which dignity
 " was further amplified by a considerable in-
 " crease of territory, at the expence of the un-
 " fortunate house of Austria. Again, on the 15th
 " of March, of the *same year*, Murat was invested
 " with the *Duchies* of Berg, and Cleves. * * * * *
 " In the *same year* Holland was *made a Kingdom*,
 " and Louis Buonaparte, a younger brother of
 " Napoleon, was placed upon the throne. In
 " *this year* Saxony also was *erected into a King-*
 " *dom*. We again read that, on the 31st of
 " March, 1806, Buonaparte submitted to the
 " Senate a variety of decrees for it's approba-
 " tion: by one of them he conferred *the King-*

“dom of Naples on his brother Joseph: by
 “another he gave to Berthier the *Principality*
 “of Neufchatel, and by another he *created a*
 “number of *Duchies*, with suitable revenues,
 “in Italy, to be distributed among the civil
 “and military officers. * * * * The *erection*
 “of the *Duchy of Benevento into a fief of the*
 “*French Empire*, in favour of Talleyrand, with
 “the title of *Prince and Duke of Benevento*,
 “and the *grant of the Duchy of Ponte Corvo to*
 “*Marshal Bernadotte*, by a similar tenure, fol-
 “lowed *some months* after the preceding esta-
 “blishments. From his Imperial Camp at
 “Finkenstein, on the other side of the Vistula,
 “Buonaparte wrote, on the 28th May, 1807, to
 “the Conservative Senate, that he had *instituted*
 “*Duchies* as rewards for eminent services done
 “him, whether military, or civil; and that in
 “pursuance of this system of encouragement
 “he had created, by letters patent, the Mar-
 “shal Le Febvre *Hereditary Duke of Dant-*
 “zig, &c.”^c

Surely no person who believes that these
 facts actually occurred in less than *one year and*
a half, can doubt that a prophecy, predicting
 the formation of ten kingdoms, may be literally
 fulfilled in *three years and a half*.

I have argued thus, because I think Mr.

^c Combined View, p. 460.

Mede's objection altogether without weight, even on his own principles: but I will not dissemble my conviction, that the passage in question does not speak of the *establishment of Kingdoms* at all. It stands thus: "The ten horns which thou sawest are TEN KINGS, which have received no KINGDOM as yet; but receive power as KINGS one hour with the Beast."⁴ It is certainly convenient for those who maintain the doctrine of 1260 years, to turn the *Kings* into *Kingdoms*, though I do not know by what rule of interpretation that is to be effected. I may perhaps have occasion to speak again of this passage in the course of this Enquiry, and in the mean time I will only say, that I believe it to refer to individual Kings; and the assumption of regal power by an individual, or his investment by a superior, is not necessarily, or even probably, a work of much time.

"2. Peoples and multitudes of nations and tongues to
"serve and obey him. (Ch. xiii.)"

From the *character* given of the Beast and the predicted *state* of the world, it does not seem to me *improbable* (much less would I dare to say impossible) that, in three years and a half, such a power as is described might attain so great a sovereignty. He is a being so ex-

⁴ Rev. xvii. 12.

In this first reason there are six things mentioned; and the whole objection rests upon the IMPOSSIBILITY of their being performed in three years and a half.

To speak of each separately.

“ 1. Ten kingdoms founded at the same hour with the beast.” Why is it IMPOSSIBLE that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half? Surely it is not unreasonable to ask for something more than dogmatical assertion. If it be said that it is very *improbable*, I reply, that this has nothing to do with the question; and that those who use great words should be prepared to stand by them. It does indeed make all the difference in the world, whether the thing can be shewn to be *impossible*, or whether it is only, in the judgment of mankind, *improbable*. But I am perfectly ready to meet the objection with this qualification; which, I suppose, it absolutely requires. Is it more *improbable* than events which have already occurred in fulfilment of prophecy? And are we to make our judgment of *probability* the test by which prophecy is to be tried, and the rule by which it is to be interpreted? It will be remembered, that this argument rests entirely on the impossibility (I am willing to qualify it into improbability) of performance; and I ask, is it more improbable that ten kingdoms should be founded in three years and a half, than that a

In order to make this objection of any weight whatever, it will be necessary to shew, 1st, that the woman arrayed in purple sits upon the Beast only under his last head, or during the 1260 days; and, 2dly, that her adulterous intercourse with the Kings of the Earth is carried on only during the same period. I apprehend it will be no easy matter to prove these points, and unless they are proved, the objection falls to the ground.

“ 6. The merchants, and all those that had ships in the
 “ sea, to grow rich by trading with her (ch. xviii.);
 “ these things should ask more than three years work,
 “ or four either.”

Much the same may be said on this point. I do not know where it is even hinted, that the traffic of the Merchants with Babylon, takes place only during the 1260 days, or during any particular period. I find no mention of the Merchants except in ch. xviii. 11—19; and, for anything that appears in that account of them, their traffic may have been carried on during the whole period of Babylon's existence.

“ II. Because that King, state of government, sovereign-
 “ ty, seignory (or what you will) of the Beast, under
 “ which the whore should ride him, followeth immedi-
 “ ately upon a former, which, in comparison, is said to
 “ continue but a short space. Rev. xvii. 10. But if
 “ the antichristian state shall continue but three years

" and a half literally taken, how short must the time
 " of that foregoing King or sovereignty be, which
 " should occasion the Holy Ghost to insert so singular
 " a note of the difference thereof from that which fol-
 " loweth that it should continue but a short space?
 " Doth not this imply, that the next state wherein the
 " whore should ride the beast, was to continue a long
 " space?"

I should really think it sufficient to answer, that I do not at all see how this is implied; and I do not think an unbiassed reader would ever have dreamed of such a thing. I am at a loss to conceive what right Mr. Mede has to say, that the statement of the brief duration of the seventh head, is a "note of the difference there, of *from that which followeth.*" The words are, "There are seven Kings; five are fallen; and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space, and the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition." How does this imply that the eighth head is to endure for a long space? Surely, if we consider the word "short" as relative at all, it is much more natural to refer it to the sixth head, whose duration will have become a past and ascertained period before the seventh head arises. To me however it appears that it is a simple statement of the brief duration of the seventh head, without reference to any other.

" III. Because if the 1260 days of the witnesses (which
 " begin and end with the time of Antichrist) be literally taken, then must their three days and an half,
 " wherein they lie slain by the beast, (ch. xi. 9) be so
 " taken also. But how is it possible the nations, and
 " people of the Earth, should make feasts, send gifts
 " and presents one unto another, in three days and an
 " half. How should the half day be a competent time
 " to distinguish or limit any of the actions there mentioned? If the Holy Ghost had meant nothing but
 " days, would he have been so precise for half a day?"

It is not my intention to repeat in this place what I have said in reply to this argument (which is stated by Mr. Faber with quite as much force and more fairness) in my former Enquiry.¹ On this statement of the argument, however, I would remark, that it is not said that "the nations and people of the Earth shall make feasts, send gifts and presents one unto another." It is merely said, "they that dwell upon the Earth;" an expression which Mr. Faber limits to the papists of the Roman Empire;² and I know of no reason for the alter-

¹ P. 26.

² "To adopt the language of prophecy, they that dwell upon the *Roman earth*, the papists of the various tongues, and nations, into which the *Great City* had been divided by the incursions of the Goths, rejoiced over the two prophets that tormented them by their troublesome admonitions, and made merry and sent gifts one to another."—Vol. II, p. 84. I should like to see a fuller account of these popish rejoicings than I have ever yet met with.

ation, which I could attribute to Mede, because according to his system, “the people and kindreds and tongues and nations,” mentioned in the preceding verse, are the *friends* of the witnesses, while these dwellers upon the Earth are their *enemies*. But in my former Enquiry I made no allusion to this limitation, or to the still greater one which is made by translating *οι κατοικηυτες επι της γης* “those who dwell on the *land*,” because I wish to meet the argument in its strongest form, and am convinced that it has no force even if we construe the phrase, “they *that dwell on the earth*,” in the utmost latitude that any reasonable man can require.

Will the reader do me the favour, or perhaps I may say the justice, to imagine that, in some way or other, the *whole human race*^h had been tormented by two prophets during three years and a half—that these prophets had power to shut heaven that it should not rain—to turn water into blood—and to smite the earth with ALL plagues so often as they would—that, dreadful as their inflictions were, there seemed

^h This immense latitude is never insisted upon except to maintain the mystical interpretation of the days; and is utterly inconsistent with all those systems which suppose the witnesses to have been already slain. Which of the events that have been supposed to fulfil that prediction was *known*, and rejoiced in, by one twentieth part of the dwellers on the earth?

to be no hope of their destruction, because fire proceeded out of their mouths, and devoured their enemies; killing infallibly all who attempted to hurt them—that, after appearing thus terrible and invincible to a world groaning beneath the torment for three years and a half, they should actually be slain in the street, or broad place, of a *great* city, by some person, or power, after whom *all the world* is wondering, (ch. xvii. 8,) and in the presence of some out of the various people and kindreds and tongues and nations of the world. Let the reader, I say, imagine this case, (and I believe nothing is supposed but what he will find distinctly stated in Rev. xi. 5—10,) and I will ask him, how long he thinks it would be before the news of such an astonishing event would issue from the *great* city, and spread through a world groaning in hopeless misery under plagues like those of Egypt?—how far would it have spread in three days and a half? and how could the equally surprising, and perhaps more incredible, intelligence of their unexpected revival, be circulated with such rapidity, as to prevent a general rejoicing, fully sufficient to answer the statement, that those that dwelt upon the earth rejoiced over them, and made merry and sent gifts one to another.

Mr. Mede however adds, “How should the
“ half day be a competent time to distinguish

“ or limit any of the actions there mentioned?” Now, to speak freely, this question seems to me to be not only unmeaning, but unfair; and, in a writer of less respectability, I should look upon it as a trap for unsuspecting readers.

Strictly speaking, there is no half day mentioned, but only a continuous period of three days and a half. If I may be allowed so familiar an illustration, it is as unfair to say, “ what can be done in half a day?” as it would be to say of any man, “ what can he buy for sixpence?” when in fact he has received three shillings and sixpence; a sum for which we have no name, and of which we cannot speak without mentioning the odd half shilling. But even if the half day is mentioned, is it pretended that it does “ distinguish or limit any of the actions there mentioned?” I do not see that any action is assigned to the half day; or that any action is assigned to the whole three days and a half, except that the bodies of the witnesses should lie publicly exposed to attest the reality of their death, while the news of that event should be circulated.

As to the question, “ If the Holy Ghost had “ meant nothing but days, would he have been “ so precise for half a day?” I wish to say nothing; and I believe my argument will not suffer materially if I pass it over without expressing the feelings which it excites.

IV. " Because six of the trumpets, and the things which
" they bring, by necessity of contemporation, are in-
" cluded in the compass of the Antichristian time.
" Two whereof, by the express times mentioned in
" them, (in the fifth of five months, ch. ix. 5, and in
" the sixth of thirteen, ch. ix. 15,) take up a year and
" an half, that is near half the time ; which, though
" far too little (if literally taken) for the great things
" prophecied in them, yet what time will they leave
" for the four other trumpets, and for the seven vials
" which also are poured out upon the beast, and afore
" his times are finished ? What time alone will the
" sixth vial require for preparing the way of the Kings
" of the East, for the frogs to go forth unto the Kings
" of the Earth, and of the whole world, to gather them
" to the battle of that great day of God Almighty, &c."

It is obvious that the strength of this objection lies in the assumption, that Mede is right in his interpretation of other parts of the prophecy ; and it happens unfortunately, that the very point on which he insists is opposed by many (I believe I may say most) other commentators. This "necessity of contemporation" is denied by the systems of Bishop Newton, Mr. Faber, Dr. Hales, Messrs. Lowman, Cunningham, and I believe many others. Perhaps, therefore, I need say little about it. The case is the same with the sixth trumpet, which Mede states must occupy thirteen months, by the "express times mentioned" in it. This is denied by Mr. Faber, who states that the time referred to was the *first* hour of the 29th day of

May, A.D. 1453, and adds in a note, "There is a question respecting the day, the hour, the month and the year, whether they denote a certain *season of continuance*, or an *appointed epoch of action*. Mr. Mede, Mr. Brightman, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Mr. Fleming, and other expositors, adopt the former opinion; Archdeacon Woodhouse, on the contrary, asserts that '*the original language will not admit of this construction*,' and therefore rejects it altogether. (Apoc. Tran. p. 260, 262, 273.) Whether his assertion be *perfectly* well founded, or not, I think him right in rejecting the idea that a *season of continuance* is intended."¹

But even supposing that Archdeacon Woodhouse is wrong, and Mede is right, (for my present business is to answer what *he* has said respecting the 1260 days, and therefore, for the sake of argument, I would admit as much as possible of *his* interpretation,) I do not see why

¹ Vol. II. p. 41.

This was written before the publication of Mr. Faber's Sacred Calendar of Prophecy. In that work, Mr. Faber reverts to what I believe was his original opinion, that a season of continuance is intended. He now makes it begin 9th of June, 1301, and end the 9th Sept. 1697. This is done by virtue of a sort of prophetic year, different from those of which the period of 1260 years is supposed to consist. They are supposed to contain 360 days each, but these 365½.—Sac. Cal. of Proph. II. 430.

it is more absurd to suppose that any given trumpet should occupy thirteen months, or 391 *days*, out of 1260 *days*; than to suppose, as he does, that it occupies 396 *years* out of 1260 *years*. The proportion is much the same.

The whole argument, however, amounts but to this:—*If* Mede has rightly interpreted the trumpets, they will take up more than three years and a half—but what if his interpretation should be wrong? That he is mistaken in some material points, the commentators whom I have mentioned, agree; and I must freely say, that his explanation of the trumpets, and every other which I have seen, is so entirely unsatisfactory to my own mind, that I know not how to argue upon the length of time required for their duration.

When it is asked, “What time alone will the “sixth vial require for preparing the way of the “Kings of the East, &c.” I must needs say, that if the enquirer expects a rational answer to this question, he ought to be able to give, or should have some reason to expect from those whom he asks, some better information respecting the Kings of the East, the length of the way, the nature of the preparation, the means and instruments to be used in that preparation, than any man living pretends to possess. How, too, can any man pretend to specify the length of time which it must take the frogs to execute

their commission, when he is expressly told that "they are spirits of devils, working miracles?" Surely such speculations as these ought not to weigh one atom, against the plain letter of Scripture.

V. "Lastly, from the event. If Antichrist's times last
 " no longer than is supposed, then, either they are
 " passed long ago, or that sixth Roman Head, which
 " in St. John's time was, is still in being. But that
 " cannot be, when neither Greek nor Latin Cæsar are
 " now remaining. If any say the Latin Cæsar still
 " remains in the German Empire, as that which
 " succeeded unto it, I demand what succession can
 " that be, where was near 350 years interruption, a
 " longer time than some famous monarchies have had
 " for their whole continuance. If the Cæsarean state
 " may revive and continue the same after so many
 " years interregnum, how shall we ever know when it
 " is dead for adoe, and the time come that Antichrist
 " should be looked for? Besides, if the times of Anti-
 " christ be so short, and therefore yet to come (as they
 " must be unless they be longer), then are we yet
 " under the times of the Red Dragon, and all the
 " Trumpets yet to come. Let it be shewn how this
 " can be, if it appear we are not under these times of
 " the Dragon, then none of the Revelation is yet
 " fulfilled."

This is another instance in which the whole force of the argument lies in the assumption, that the author is right in other parts of his system. Whether the sixth head had or had not fallen in his time, I am sure I cannot tell—

but Mr. Faber absolutely contradicts the supposition; and matter in dispute between such writers forms but a bad foundation for an argument. Mr. Faber says, "From the commencement of the reign of Augustus, down to the memorable year 1806, a period which comprises a longer term than even eighteen centuries, the world has never been without an Emperor of the Romans; but in that year, for the first time, this ancient title disappeared from off the face of the earth, and we may now say, in the language of prophecy, six Roman Heads are fallen." ^k

It is really curious (especially considering Mr. Faber's strong language respecting the concurrence of expositors) to see two such writers, as himself and Mr. Mede, disputing whether, during whole centuries, there were any such things as Roman Emperors in existence.

With regard to the second part of this objection, in which Mr. Mede argues, that if the 1260 days are taken literally, the period of Antichrist must be future, and therefore we must be "yet

^k Vol. III. p. 21. In this new work Mr. Faber has altered his scheme of the heads, and making the first head go to sleep at the expulsion of Tarquin, supposes it to have revived in Augustus, and to have continued alive and awake until the year 1806. This of course makes no difference as to the point for which his opinion is here quoted.

“under the times of the Red Dragon,” I answer at once—that I believe the period of Antichrist is still future; and whatever may be thought of this opinion, it is matter of pure amazement to me how any man can doubt that we are “under the times of the Red Dragon.” Is it not plainly declared that the Dragon is Satan himself? What meaning is there in language, or how are we to expect assurance from a written revelation, if we can make the Dragon any thing but the great enemy of man, while we read, “The great Dragon was cast out, that old Serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world.” (Rev. xii. 9.) No doubt we are under his times, and the “accuser of the brethren” is not yet cast down. Should this lead, as Mr. Mede intimates, to the supposition that the trumpets are still future, I cannot help it. It is not my business to defend his system; and the fact that the great Red Dragon is the Devil, seems to me so clearly revealed, that I should think it would raise a doubt in the mind of any reasonable person, as to the soundness of any system of interpretation incompatible with it. I do believe that the trumpets are all still future, and (as I have already said) all the interpretations which I have seen describing their fulfilment, appear to me so forced and unsatisfactory, as strongly to confirm this opinion.

Having thus gone through the five arguments, I proceed to notice an objection which Mr. Mede has appended to them.

“ Objection. But what example elsewhere in Scripture
“ of days signifying years?

“ Answer. Daniel's seventy weeks. But you will say
“ the etymology of the Hebrew word שבוע is as ap-
“ plicable to sevens of years as sevens of days, and
“ therefore this instance proves not. I answer, the
“ question lies not in the etymology but the use,
“ wherein שבוע always signifies sevens of days, and
“ never sevens of years: wheresoever it is absolutely
“ put it means of days, is no where used of years.

“ Objection. But in the tenth of Daniel we find, as it
“ were for distinction's sake, weeks of days; which
“ intimates there are weeks of years, which the use of
“ the word might indifferently signify.

“ Answer. It is ill translated; the Vulgar is better.
“ which hath days of weeks—‘ Lugebam trium Heb-
“ domadarum diebus,’ meaning that Daniel fasted and
“ did eat no meat in the day time for three weeks to-
“ gether, or some such like sense. (Gen. xxix. 27.)
“ The week which Laban would have Jacob fulfil be-
“ fore he gave him Rachel was not the seven years’
“ service, but the seven days of Leah's wedding feast,
“ as the Targum translates, and the Vulgar, ‘ Imple
“ hebdomadam dierum hujus copulæ.’ Nor can it be
“ otherwise by the age of Rachel's children.

“ Secondly. Let it be shewn in all the prophecy of
“ Daniel (or, for aught I know, in any other of the
“ prophets), where times of things prophesied expressed
“ by days are not to be understood of years. For
“ when the Angel means days, in Daniel, he express-
“ eth it, therefore, not by days (for so it were doubt-

“ful), but by evenings and mornings, ch. viii. 14, when he speaks of the persecution of Antiochus.”

With regard to the argument drawn from the prophecy of the seventy weeks, I have already spoken fully in my former Enquiry; and I believe I have there noticed every part of it, except that which, in order to get rid of Daniel's three weeks of days, (Dan. x.) suggests that he did not eat in the day time, “or some such like sense,” which I really think requires no answer at all. To avoid repetition, therefore, I shall pass at once to the second answer: “Let it be shewn in all the prophecy of Daniel (or, for ought I know, in any other of the Prophets) where times of things prophesied expressed by days are not to be understood of years.”

I am perfectly amazed at this brave challenge, which I sincerely lament, because I know that bold assertion will generally carry the multitude by storm;¹ and that comparatively few readers

¹ This is not all, or perhaps the worst, when such broad assertions are made by writers of name. Ready-made demonstrations,” and “certainties,” and “impossibilities,” and bold, round assertions, are very handy for persons who undertake to lay down the law on subjects which are somewhat new to them. Dr. Hamilton, in his recent publication against the Millenarians, says, “Notwithstanding all that Mr. Maitland has urged to the contrary; in EVERY OTHER CASE, a day in the language of prophecy, denotes a year.” Pref. p. xi.

Whatever astonishment I might feel that such an asser-

take the trouble to enquire whether a writer has good ground, or any ground, for what he affirms with confidence. I answer that I know

tion should be made by Mede, I was less surprised to find it in the work of a writer who had just before made this frank, but humiliating, confession;—"It is matter of regret that the service which I have attempted in the following pages to discharge, has fallen into my hands. Few of my brethren could have been more unqualified for the undertaking. Prophecy and the Millenium had attracted *less of my attention* than the other parts of Revelation. They had seldom *presented themselves* to my notice in the course of expounding the Scriptures weekly to my congregation." p. ix. How it happened that the prophecies presented themselves but seldom "in the course of expounding the Scriptures," I cannot well understand; but I do not say that it was Dr. Hamilton's duty to have attempted any explanation of them, if they had. I think, however, that every man of real Christian spirit, whether he be a Millenarian or not, must join in the regret which the author expresses; especially as it is not apparent, or in any way, that I have seen, explained, why a person who considered himself (and who from the simple fact which he states evidently was) peculiarly disqualified for the business, should have undertaken it. Neither does it appear why, if the author wished to write a book, he did not take one of "the other parts of Revelation," with which his words seem to imply that he considered himself better acquainted; or why, if he must write a book on this subject, so momentous to all, so new to him, and, in the judgment of all parties, requiring so much calm and patient investigation, he should have done it "during a busy season of the year, when he was imperatively bound to attend to more important matters."

of only these prophecies in the Scriptures which predict a period in *terms of days*, and whether *any one* of them is to be understood of years, the reader may judge :—

1. That respecting the Deluge, “ Yet *seven*
“ *days* and I will cause it to rain upon
“ the earth *forty days and forty nights.*”
Gen. vii. 4.
2. Joseph’s prediction relating to the But-
ler and Baker, “ the three Branches are
“ *three days*—yet *within three days* shall
“ Pharoah lift up thine head and restore
“ thee, &c.” Gen. xl. 12. “ The three
“ baskets are *three days,*” &c. v. 18.
3. Where it is predicted respecting certain
of the plagues of Egypt, that they should
be inflicted or removed, on the *next day.*
Ex. viii. 10, ix. 5, x. 4.
4. The prediction to Joshua, that on the
seventh day the walls of Jericho should
fall. Jos. vi. 4.
5. The prophecy of Elisha, at the siege of
Samaria, that the *next day* a measure of
fine flour should be sold for a shekel.
II. Kings, vii. 1.
6. Jonah’s prophecy respecting Nineveh,
“ Yet *forty days* and Nineveh shall be
“ overthrown.” Jon. iii. 4.
7. Our Lord’s predictions relating to him-
self, that, as Jonah had been three days

and three nights in the whale's belly, so he should be *three days and nights* in the heart of the earth, Matt. xii. 40; and that he would in *three days* rebuild that temple which they should destroy. John ii. 19.

8. Beside these, I am not aware of any other passage but that relating to the *ten days*, mentioned Rev. ii. 10, of which I have spoken already; and which, as far as I can find, the greater part of commentators do not understand to mean years.

I am not aware that any individual has ever supposed the word "day," in any one of these passages, (except the 7th and 8th) to mean year. There are, indeed, those who imagine the ten days in No. 8 to refer to Dioclesian's persecution; and others, who suppose the three days in No. 7 to be fulfilled by our Lord's personal ministry during three years, but their opinion is far from being generally received. I would, however, particularly recommend the second passage to the attention of those who talk of "*symbolical*" prophecies, and argue that in the explanations of them we must expect the periods to be mystically expressed.

Let me ask in my turn,—Is there any prophecy which is known to have been fulfilled in a given number of *years*, (except that of the

seventy weeks,) the period of which had been specified otherwise than *by years*? I find these predictions in terms of *years*:—

1. The bondage of Abraham's posterity in Egypt, during 400 years. Gen. xv. 13.
2. The seven years of plenty and of famine, predicted by Joseph to Pharoah. Gen. xli. 27.
3. The forty years' wandering of the Israelites. Num. xiv. 33.
4. The seven years of famine predicted by Elisha. II. Kings, viii. 1.
5. The sixty-five years respecting Ephraim. Is. vii. 8.
6. The three years respecting Moab. Isa. xvi. 14.
7. The seventy years respecting Tyre. Is. xxiii. 15-17, Jerem. xxv. 11, 12.
8. The two years relating to Jechoniah's return. Jerem. xxviii. 3, 11.
9. The seventy years' captivity. Jerem. xxix. 10.
10. The forty years' desolation of Egypt. Ezek. xxix. 12, 13.

I would beg the reader to consider these passages, and then to look again to Mr. Mede's question, and I think he will wonder how a writer, so well acquainted with the Scripture, could ever propose it; and I wish it may lead him to examine, meekly but carefully, all such

broad assertions, even when sanctioned by names as much entitled to veneration as that of Mede.

The remainder of this objection, which relates to the application of the 2300 Evenings and Mornings, (Dan. viii. 14) to Antiochus Epiphanes, is now, I apprehend, of no other use than to shew that Mede's opinion differed from that of almost all his successors; and is directly opposed to all the popular systems of the present day. Most modern writers, I believe, are prepared to follow Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton, and to say with the latter, "these 2300 days can by no computation be accommodated to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, even though the days be taken for Natural days."^m To mention only the three writers to whom I have before alluded, and whom I quote as the most popular writers on the subject, Mr. Faber, Mr. Frere, and Mr. Cuninghame; all concur in understanding the days to mean years, though no two of them agree as to when the period began, and while Mr. Cuninghame makes the period 2300 years, Mr. Faber and Mr. Frere make it 2400. For my own part, I should agree with Mr. Mede in supposing the mornings and evenings to mean natural days, though not for the reason which

^m Vol. II. p. 73.

he suggests. If, as he supposes, the angel avoided saying *days*, lest he should be supposed to mean *years*, the end has not been answered, for, as I have stated, almost every modern writer does understand him to mean *years*. I merely suppose the 2300 evenings and mornings are to be taken literally, because I know of no reason for supposing otherwise. If it be asked why it pleased God to employ this form of expression, rather than the simple word *day*, I do not know that I am bound to find or to make a reason; but to myself it does not appear very unnatural, considering that the subject matter of the prophecy is the cessation of the *morning* and *evening* sacrifice.

Having thus gone through the five reasons adduced by Mede, I venture, with some confidence, to ask the reader whether it is not too much to say that they "CLEARLY DEMONSTRATE the antichristian, or apostatical times, to be more than three single years and a half."

REMARKS

ON A

PASSAGE IN "DIALOGUES ON PROPHECY,"

PART IV. P. 312.

- " *Philaletes*.—Do you feel quite confident the 1260
" days means always 1260 years?
- " *Anastasius*.—The question in this place is rather, what
" period is meant to be measured by the words 'time,
" times, and half a time.' The argument drawn from
" the word 'day,' never meaning a 'year' in other
" parts of Scripture, is wholly inapplicable here, for
" the word is 'time,' and not 'day;' and certainly
" there is as much right to assume that the word 'time'
" signifies a 'year' as any other period; and it will
" hardly be contended that, in the fourth chapter, ver.
" 16, of this same prophet, the word signifies only a
" day, when during 'seven times' Nebuchadnezzar
" was to have his nails grow as long as birds' claws,
" his hair like eagles' feathers, and he was to be driven
" from men. In chap. xi. 13, we find the expression,
" 'shall certainly come at the end of times, even years,'
" *marg.*, which alone might settle the question."

This may be very conclusive against those
persons who have contended that a "time"

means a literal day; and really such freedom has been used in accommodating the terms of time to the events which particular periods were required to contain, that I can readily believe such writers to exist, though I have not met with any of their works. The Jews are charged by Justin Martyr with making a "time" a century; and I could easily bring a Protestant commentator to back that interpretation, or to maintain that *days* are literal *days*, or *weeks*, or *months*, or *years* (of different sorts,) or even *periods* of 360 years. I can therefore suppose that some writers may maintain that the "times" of Daniel mean *days*, or even hours.^a As, however, I have not maintained such an opinion, or any one compatible with it, it is not my place to defend it. Indeed, if the author of the Dialogues should succeed in proving that a "time" means a literal *year*, it is obvious that

^a Scaliger, indeed, seems to use the words *time* and *day* as synonyms.—He makes the $3\frac{1}{2}$ *times*, the period which elapsed between the rise of the Albigenses, and the Reformation; "*car un temps ou jour en l' Ecriture signifie cent ans.*" Scaligerana, prima, p. 39. Is not the reader prepared to exclaim with Vitringa, "*Quam hoc docte et pie cogitatum!*" He adds, however, with a simplicity which in a commentator of less gravity might almost induce a suspicion that his admiration was ironical, "*magno tamen merer carer, loca adscripta esse, quæ Scaliger respexerit, ubi annos in verbo Dei pro Secularibus sumi dicit.*"—Cited by Langius Gloria Chr. p. 122.

he will establish my doctrine at the expence of his own. But he proceeds—

“ With respect to the word ‘ day’ not being used in symbolical prophecies for a year, I know not how this new conceit has got into some people’s heads ; but since it is there, we must revert to our elements of criticism again ; so true is it in this, as in every thing else, ‘ there is nothing new beneath the sun.’

“ *Multa renascentur quæ jam cecidere cadentque*

“ *Quæ nunc sunt in honore.*”

Can the author really mean that he *does not know* how this “conceit” has got into some people’s heads ; and is he so little acquainted with the history of interpretation, as to suppose that it is a “new” one ? Can he mention a writer, from the days of St. Paul to those of Wickliffe, who has maintained that “ days ” stand for “ years,” either in symbolical prophecies, or in any other part of the Scripture ?

I proceed, however, to notice the authorities which are brought forward against the literal interpretation of the days.

“ Dr. Cressener says, speaking of another prophecy of

“ Daniel, namely, the 70 weeks, or 490 days, that

“ they are taken for so many years, ‘ by almost the

“ UNANIMOUS CONSENT of ALL INTERPRETERS.’

“ Dem. of Apoc. 170.

“ Whiston says, ‘ there can remain no reasonable doubt

“ in the case.’ p. 17.

“ By Bishop Chandler you are referred to Aulus Gellius,

“ who, in Lib. III. ch. x., gives an account of a work
 “ of M. Varro, on the number seven, in which the
 “ author, ‘ *addit se jam duodecimam annorum hebdoma-*
 “ *dam ingressum esse*; that is, in his 78th year, ‘ *et ad*
 “ *eum diem Septuaginta hebdomadas librorum conscrip-*
 “ *sisse*,’ from which expressions it is clear that the
 “ mode of counting days as years was not unusual
 “ even by the heathen.”

As to the statement of Dr. Cressener, even supposing that, instead of relating to the 70 weeks, (of which I have spoken fully in my former Enquiry,) his words had reference to the 1260 days, what is it to the purpose? It is not denied that the 1260 days are taken for years “ by almost the unanimous consent of all interpreters,” in the limited sense in which such round assertions of commentators must be very commonly understood—that is, by most *protestant* interpreters—a limitation absolutely necessary, unless we suppose him who makes the assertion to be altogether ignorant or dishonest; and which very conveniently gets rid of the primitive church, the whole body of the fathers, and, in fact, of every writer before the Reformation. I began my former Enquiry by stating that my design was “ to promote an investigation of the grounds on which *most protestant commentators* have been led to consider the “ prophetic period of Daniel and St. John as “ consisting of 1260 years.” I did not question

the fact, but the reason of it; and I did not suppose that such a question could be decided by a collection of authorities. If I had, I might have cited enough from those writers who lived during the long course of ages, in which (as far as I know) nobody doubted that the days were literal days; and even among protestant writers, notwithstanding their "*almost* unanimous consent," I believe I might have paraded the names of Scaliger, Forbes, Bullinger, Broughton, Lightfoot, Langius, Venerna, Leydekker, Bengel, Roos, Wetstein, Grotius, Hammond, Brown, Michaelis, Herder, Storr, Eichorn, Bertholdt, and Dathe; and might probably have found many more, if I had taken the trouble to look for them. Where a question has been much litigated, nothing is more easy than to multiply authorities on either side; but I should be unwilling to rest my argument in any degree upon the *mere dicta* of any writer, whose judgment I did not respect in other matters; and I should think that any advantage which I might gain over an adversary by such means was scarcely fair. While, for instance, I believe Whiston to have been a peculiarly wrong-headed man, I should think that my opinion would derive very little real support from his affirming that "there could be no reasonable doubt in the case;" though his name might swell my list of authorities; and his bold

assertion might carry away those who might not be aware, that on the same principle of submission to his authority, they should deny the Deity of Christ, and bind up the Sibylline Oracles in their bibles, by way of returning to what he called "primitive christianity." *Arguments*, even from persons more absurd and heretical than Whiston, demand attention; but the *mere dicta* of such persons are entitled to none whatever.

It will be much for the reader's advantage, not only to investigate how far writers quoted are to be admitted as *authorities*, when bare, dogmatic assertions are produced; but also, *when facts are stated*, to enquire how far they warrant the inferences drawn from them. A striking illustration is offered in the next sentence. It is certainly true that Aulus Gellius devotes a whole chapter to giving an account of a work by M. Varro, on the various virtues and powers of the number *seven*, which after the Greeks he called a "hebdomad."° Gellius, having stated many of his sayings on the subject, adds, that so far he wrote well enough; but that, beside these, he had put together some poor conceits about the seven wonders of the world, &c.; adding also, with respect to

° "Septenarii numeri quem Græci *ἑβδομάδα* appellant, "Virtutes, potestatesque multas, variasque dicit."

himself, that he had entered upon his twelfth hebdomad of years, and had up to that time written seventy hebdomads of books.^p

Now, is it not most surprising, that this conceit of Varro's, which, as far as appears, was wholly his own, and which is quoted in a contemptuous manner by the writer who has preserved it, should be confidently produced to shew that "the mode of counting days as years" was *not unusual* even by THE HEATHEN.^q To me it seems to prove nothing but that the old gentleman having written a whole book on the number seven, had so filled his mind with hebdomads, that he saw them (as Brown did the quincunx) where nobody else ever dreamed of the matter; and therefore indulged himself

^p "Hæc Varro de numero septenario scripsit admodum "conquisitè, sed *alia quoque ibidem congerit frigidiuscula;* "veluti septem opera esse in orbe terrarum miranda, et sapientes item veteres septem fuisse, et curricula ludorum "circensium solemnia septem esse, et ad oppugnandas "Thebas duces septem delectos. Tum ibi addit se quoque "jam duodecimam annorum hebdomadam ingressum esse "et ad eum diem Septuaginta hebdomadas librorum conscripsisse: ex quibus aliquammultos, quum proscriptus "esset, direptis bibliothecis suis non comparuisse."—Aul. Gell. Lib. III. c. 10.

^q If it proved any thing, surely it would rather prove that the Heathen counted *years* for *days*. But then, perhaps, we are to suppose that if they did one, they did the other. Why not? But does it not quite as much prove that they counted *books* for *days*?

in the conceit of stating his own age, and how many books he had written, in terms of his favourite number. I believe that the mode of counting days as years was altogether unknown "by the heathen." If it "was not unusual," plenty of instances may be brought; and I wonder that they have not been adduced by writers like Mede or Faber, from whom we are warranted to expect all that classical learning, and a knowledge of pagan antiquity, can bring to the elucidation of the subject.

But the author proceeds—

"Lowth on Jer, xxx. 7, says, 'The word day often comprehends a succession of time, in which a whole series of events is transacted.' 'The word day, says Mede, p. 945, 'is used ordinarily for *tempus*, yea, *longissimum*.' Daubuz observes, that 'the terms of days and years must be determined by the circumstances and intent of the writer.' Gataker has shewn that even the word *ἡμερα* is often employed in an enlarged sense. More, speaking of the term three days and a half, says this last expression would of itself be sufficient to shew the absurdity of confining the term day to a period of 24 hours, adding, 'there are scarce any now so ignorant as not to be ashamed to conceal these days to be natural days.'^r Myst. of

^r The remark already made on Whiston, applies equally to More. It is a mere dogmatical assertion of what is perhaps hardly true in the latitude in which it is likely to be taken by most readers. I imagine, however, that the "scarce any" who took the days for literal days were, and always will be, more numerous than those who adopt More's own opinion, that each of those days is a period of 360 years. Apocalypsis Apocalypseos, p. 106.

“ God, p. 177. Dr. Kennedy observes, p. 581, that
 “ the word $\square$ sometimes denotes 12 hours, as in Gen.
 “ i. 5, viii, 12, and sometimes 24 hours, as Gen. i. 5,
 “ and vii. 17; and ‘ when this term occurs without any
 “ explanatory adjuncts, it seems to be quite indefinite,
 “ and to carry along with it no determinate signifi-
 “ cation at all.’ M. Gibert, in a letter published in
 “ Amsterdam, in 1743, shows, by the authorities of
 “ Macrobius, Eudoxus, Varro, Diodorus Siculus,
 “ Pliny, Plutarch, St. Augustin, &c., that by *a year*
 “ the ancients meant the revolution of any planet in the
 “ heavens, so that it sometimes consisted only of one
 “ day. See Encyclop. Art. Chronology.”

The word *day*, and its representatives, in every language of which I have any knowledge, does, I believe, signify, and is “ used ordinarily for *tempus*—*yea longissimum*.” Thus the “ day of the Lord,” the “ day of vengeance,” the “ day of small things,” &c. as these phrases are used in the scripture, are periods which nobody supposes to consist of twenty-four, or any other particular number of hours. The word, however, cannot be used in the Hebrew language with more latitude than it is in our own; yet who ever dreamed that such a use of the term would warrant, or in any way give colour to, our understanding a *given number* of *days* to mean that precise number of *years*? Let us apply this argument to our own language; to which, I believe, it is equally applicable. Suppose we should read of any convict, that “ as

“ long as he remained in this country, and was
“ able to pursue his evil courses with impunity,
“ he turned a deaf ear to all good advice ; but
“ in the day of adversity his heart was gradu-
“ ally softened, and his whole conduct seemed
“ to indicate a complete reformation. On his
“ return to England, he immediately sought
“ out his father, and entreated his forgiveness,
“ with every mark of contrition; but after he
“ had spent two days of sobriety and peace in
“ the bosom of his family, he was discovered
“ by his old associates in crime, whom he re-
“ joined, and with whom he soon after commit-
“ ted that offence for which he incurred a
“ second seven years’ transportation.” What
if some critic should maintain from this pas-
sage, that the subject of the narrative lived
decently with his friends, after his return, for
fourteen years? Should we not laugh in his
face, if he told us that the word *day* in the
English language often signified “ *tempus—yea*
“ *longissimum* ;” that “ without some explana-
“ tory adjuncts” it seemed to be “ quite indefi-
“ nite,” and in “ their absence to carry along
“ with it no determinate signification at all ;”
that in the present case, however, the author
had given us a clue to the sense in which he
used it, by calling the first period of exile a *day*
of adversity; and that it would violate all the
rules of homogeneity to suppose that he spoke

of figurative and literal days in the same sentence ; that every canon of interpretation, and sound criticism, required that the *days* of sobriety and peace should be of the same nature, kind, or quality, as the *day* of adversity, which was indisputably and irresistibly DEMONSTRATED to have extended to no less a period than seven literal years.

It may perhaps be said—"Yes ; but we are "not here speaking of plain matters of fact, "but of a symbolical prophecy." I answer, that we are speaking of no such thing, but of the way in which the word day is "*ordinarily*" used ; and this ordinary use is the whole foundation of the present argument. Let us keep to one thing at a time ; as to symbolical prophecies, I have said something already, and shall have occasion to say more in the course of this Enquiry. With the argument drawn from the way in which the word day is "ordinarily used," they have obviously nothing to do. As far as I know, the word "day" is ordinarily used in Hebrew as it is in English, and has nothing more mysteriously indefinite about it in one language than in the other. If then the argument is good in one language, it is equally good in the other ; but the truth is, that when stripped of its reference to the Hebrew language, and translated into plain English, it is not easy to overlook its absurdity.

If in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, or any other language, a passage could be produced, either in a symbolical prophecy or any where else, (I say nothing of *ordinary* use—for that is really too much) in which a definite number of *years* has been expressed by the word *days*, it will be to the purpose.

As to what Mr. Gibert has said, I do not see that any reply is necessary; for at the utmost it can only go to shew that a *year* may mean a *day*—but as I have not yet seen it, and in fact do not well understand where to look for it, I know not how far even that is proved.

The author adds—

“ The Jews *unanimously* have considered the days of
“ Daniel to be symbolical of years, and in order not to
“ weary you with quotations, yon may consult at your
“ leisure the Talmud, Treatise of Sanhedrim, ch. xi.
“ p. 97.”

This is a most amazing assertion. As I cannot find any thing on the subject in the corresponding part of the Mishna, I presume that the reference is intended to apply to the Gemara, which I have not the opportunity of consulting. I wish that the passage had been given; for surely, however familiar the author himself may be with the Gemaras, he must have known that they were inaccessible, or unintelligible, to nine tenths of his readers; and that to tell them to “ consult the Talmud, at their leisure,” was

little more than a mockery. What the passage referred to may contain, I know not; but I must flatly contradict the assertion that “the Jews unanimously have considered the days of Daniel to be symbolical of years.”

I am as unwilling as the author of the Dialogues to tire my readers with quotations; but yet I shall beg leave to offer the testimony of two Jews, who are pretty good authorities in such a case.

The first is that of JOSEPHUS. That he understood the times of Daniel to mean literal years, is evident from his application of the prophecy to the profanation of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. He says, “this desolation happened to the Temple in the 145th year, on the 25th day of the month Apelleus, and on the 153d Olympiad; but it was dedicated anew, on the same day, the 25th of the month Apelleus, on the 148th year, and on the 154th Olympiad. And this desolation came to pass according to the prophecy of Daniel, &c.”^{*} He also distinctly applies the prophecy of the 1290 days to Antiochus Epiphanes.[†]

The second is that of ABEN EZRA, who quotes SAADIAS GAON. Speaking of the pro-

^{*} Antiq. B. xii. c. 7. § 6. Whiston's Trans.

[†] Antiq. B. x. c. xi. § 7.

phesy of the seventy weeks, he says, “Dixit
 “honorabilis magister noster Saadias, quod
 “istæ septimanæ sunt annorum. Testimonium
 “autem hujus rei est illud quod Daniel dicit
 “post hæc Dan. x. 2, &c. ‘Ego Daniel fui
 “lugens tribus hebdomadibus *dierum*, panem
 “desiderabilem non comedi, &c. usque ad com-
 “plementum trium hebdomadarum *dierum*,’ et
 “*non memoravit* cum septuaginta hebdomadi-
 “bus, *dies*. Recte autem exponit et bene. —
 “— — — *Et scito, quod dies semper sunt*
 “*dies et nunquam anni in sacra scriptura*; verum
 “possibile est si dixerit *dies*, quod sit annus
 “perfectus, redeunte anno in iteratione *dierum*,
 “ut cum dicitur Ex. xiii. 10, a die diando
 “*מִיָּמָה מִיָּמָה* id est ab anno in annum; qui sunt
 “annus perfectus. Cum vero dicitur *cum nu-*
 “*mero*, duo dies, tres dies, *non possunt* esse
 “anni; sed oportet quod sint dies sicut sunt:
 “et propter hoc dicitur Lev. xxv. 8, *שְׁבַת שָׁנִים*
 “*שִׁבְעַ* ‘Et numerabis tibi septem hebdomadas
 “*annorum*, &c.” Aben Ezra, ap. Ray. Martini
 Pug. Fid. Part iii. c. xvi. p. 867.

REMARKS

ON A

REVIEW IN THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER,

FOR JUNE, 1828. VOL. xxviii. p. 396.

The writer of this article has said but little in support of the arguments which I opposed, or in answer to those which I urged ; but seems to rely principally on reserved forces, which he thinks have not yet been brought into the field in an effective manner. I shall not, however, wait for their attack, without attempting to reconnoitre these divisions on their march; and if I cannot intercept and cut them off on the way, yet perhaps even the knowledge that they are watched may lead to their coming up in a more disciplined and orderly manner than such troops sometimes do; and may prevent their relying on any of those tricks, by which an unsuspected and unknown enemy may sometimes throw a camp into confusion.

“ There are,” says the Reviewer, “ some classes of argument on the subject which have hitherto been very inadequately noticed, but which strongly convince

“ us that the period is years, and not literal days ;
 “ such as the analogies arising from the general figura-
 “ tive and mysterious style of Daniel and the Apoca-
 “ lypse in *other* matters, and which may therefore well
 “ be concluded to apply also to the calculations of time ;
 “ the figurative dress of this very expression of time
 “ itself, such as ‘ time, times, and dividing of time ;’
 “ and what seems to us a very powerful argument, the
 “ usages of chronical calculation in all nations, among
 “ none of whom, we believe, are large masses of time
 “ expressed in small fractional parts. It would be
 “ quite unusual to speak of a literal three years and a
 “ half as 1260 days ; and if it is replied, that we must
 “ be prepared to expect an unusual mode of speaking
 “ under all the circumstances of the case, we wish only
 “ to go one step further, which will lead to the prophe-
 “ tic substitution of days for years ; and in truth,
 “ throughout scripture, we often find words thus used
 “ in a large sense, the specific mensuration of which
 “ must be adjusted by the scope of the passage.”

With regard to the first class of arguments mentioned by the Reviewer, viz. “ *the analogies arising from the general figurative and mysterious style of Daniel and the Apocalypse in other mat- ters,*” I admit that it has been very “ inade- quately noticed ” by those who have main- tained the *literal* interpretation ; and I will endeavour to supply the deficiency ; but surely great use has been made of this argument by those who hold the *figurative* exposition, and I believe that it has been the chief support of their system. If, indeed, the Reviewer means

that this argument has not been propounded formally, and argued logically in detail, I believe that is true; but so used it would have been of infinitely less service. The way to make the most of it is to speak vaguely of “the *general* figurative and mysterious style of “Daniel and the Apocalypse;” and, when any startling interpretation is challenged, to reply—“Really the *general* style of Daniel and the “Apocalypse is so figurative and mysterious, “that you must not be surprised though the “interpretation should be very strange—you “cannot be allowed to object to it on the “ground that the prophet does *not* seem to say “this, or *does* seem to say something else—at “all events, while the *general style is so figura- “tive and mysterious*, how can you doubt that “this may be mystical also; and ought you not “to be prepared to meet with something in the “solution of a mystery which should surprise “you?—can you prove that my interpretation “is wrong?”

Thus an interpreter may always reduce his opponent to the proof of a negative, after having cut off all appeal to common understanding. His advantage is obvious; but in order to maintain it he must keep to vague statements. His champion must keep around him the mist in which he enters the field; and thus magnified and indefinite, he may create so much alarm as

to prevent a discovery of the important fact that he is little more than a scare-crow. I confess that I was long deterred by a confused idea, gathered from such vague statements, from trying how far the rules of common sense and common understanding applied to the *language* of these books. When, however, I did make the attempt, I was fully convinced that, whatever difficulties might exist in Daniel and the Apocalypse, they had been ascribed to a wrong source. That though the books themselves were "mysterious and figurative," yet they were not "mysterious" because the language was "figurative," and that strictly speaking their "style" was neither mysterious nor figurative in any extraordinary degree.

Here, I apprehend, lies the ambiguity which has given currency to the argument, if it deserve that name—if by *style* we mean what may perhaps be called the *construction* of these revelations, or the *mode* by which certain things were revealed to the prophet or the apostle, or the *plan* which God was pleased to adopt for the purpose of revelation; that I grant was both mysterious and figurative; because it consisted, for the most part, of symbols addressed to the senses, having a mystical meaning which was not apparent to him who saw them, and was only partially explained to him—but, if by *style* we are to understand what we generally do when

we speak of a book, the mode in which a writer makes use of words to express the ideas which he wishes to convey, then I venture to say that the "style" of Daniel and St. John is *not* remarkably mysterious or figurative; and in fact that the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse together, contain not half so much figurative language as any one of the four Gospels.

But this question appears to deserve a more particular discussion, for it is one that certainly has been hitherto very "inadequately noticed;" and the vague idea of mystery which exists forms a last resort and strong hold of fanciful interpreters. Indeed, when once a commentator condescends to get within these rules he is not to be taken.

I apprehend that the prophetic portion of the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse consists of three parts, very easily distinguishable from each other, viz.—

- I. *Descriptions* of symbols.
- II. *Explanations* of symbols.
- III. Prophecies delivered *without* symbolical representation.

I. The first class of passages in Daniel consists of—

The description of the Image. Ch. ii. 31—35.

The description of the second vision of Nebuchadnezzar,
under the symbol of a tree. Ch. iv.
10—17.

———— of the four beasts. Ch. vii. 2—14, 19—22.

———— of the vision of the Ram and He-Goat.
Ch. viii. 3—12.

Now in all these passages I am not aware that there is any thing that can be called a figurative expression, except that a *horn* is said to be plucked up by the *roots*.

Much the same may be said of the *descriptive* part of the Apocalypse; but it is not necessary to specify all the *descriptions*, for my present business is with the *explanatory* part.

II. I proceed to the *explanatory* parts of these books, which are as follows:—

1. Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's first dream, ch. ii. 36—45. I do not know of any thing which can be called a figurative expression, except that Daniel, in his explanation, so far adopts the language of the symbol, as to speak of *breaking kingdoms* in pieces. V. 41.
2. Daniel's interpretation of the King's second dream, ch. iv. 24—25; and I believe it contains no figurative expression.
3. The general explanation which Daniel received respecting the four beasts, vii. 17, 18; of which the same may be said.
4. The more particular explanation given to him in the same chapter (v. 23—27).

It is here that the phrase “time, times, and dividing
“of time,” occurs. Putting this aside, as the point in

dispute, and also the common interpretation of ten *Kings* by ten *Kingdoms*, which I believe to be incorrect, and have elsewhere disputed, I believe that this explanation contains nothing figurative; except that here, as in the first passage, the language of the symbols is so far adopted, as that we read of a *Kingdom* as *devouring* the whole earth, in v. 23, and of the same Kingdom being *consumed*, in v. 26. Whether the question of the Saint, and the answer, ch. viii. 13, 14, should be put in this class, or the next, I am not certain; at any rate, the only expression in it, on which a question can be raised, is the "2300 days," which, of course, must be set aside in the present enquiry.

5. The explanation of the vision of the Ram and He-Goat, ch. viii. 19—26; which contains, I think, nothing figurative, unless it be the command to "shut up" the vision.

These are, I believe, all the professedly *explanatory* passages in the book of Daniel. There are five also in the Apocalypse.

1. Ch. i. 20. The explanation that the seven *stars* were seven *angels*, and the seven *candlesticks* seven *churches*. Whether the word *angels* is in this place figurative, the reader must decide for himself.
2. Ch. v. 6; where it is said that the seven horns and eyes of the Lamb are the *seven spirits* of God. On this too the reader will form his own opinion.
3. Ch. vii. 14. The explanation respecting the white-robed multitude. They are said to have "washed" their robes and made them white in the blood of the "Lamb." This is certainly a figurative expression; but one which, I believe, has not been considered as obscure.

4. Ch. xiv. 4, 5. The explanation respecting the 144,000 virgin followers of the Lamb. How far this is figurative I know not.
5. Ch. xvii. 7—18. The mystery of the woman, and the beast that carried her, is explained by the angel. If the seven *Kings* are *Kingdoms*, (which I very much doubt,) the word *King* is used figuratively: if not, I believe the passage contains no figurative expression, except that of “eating the flesh” of the woman, a phrase evidently adopted from the symbol of her destroyer—the wild beast of the vision.

I am not aware that the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse contain any other passages which are *professedly explanatory*, and how far these are rendered obscure by a “mysterious and figurative style,” I wish the reader to consider. He will remember that it is in one of these *professedly explanatory* parts that the contested passage of Daniel occurs.

III. Of the third class, or prophecies delivered *without* symbolical representation, it is not necessary to speak in detail; and to do so would only lead us from our subject. I apprehend that, if the reader takes the pains to search them out, he will find very little that can be called *figurative* language which is not very plain and obvious. Let him take, for instance, the xi. and xii. chapters of Daniel. They contain, indeed, such figurative expressions as, *breaking* and *plucking up* a kingdom (v. 4), a

branch of her *roots* (v. 8), sons *stirred up* and one *overflowing* (v. 10), land *consumed* (v. 16), the arms of a *flood overflowing* (v. 22), the *fattest* places of the provinces (v. 24), &c. Who will venture to insinuate that the great (and, I believe, hitherto unexplained) mysteries of these chapters arise from the use of such common and obvious figures, or from any *peculiar, mystical, or unwonted* use of words?

I am fully aware that it is difficult to express myself in opposition to current opinions without being misunderstood by those who do not mean to misrepresent, and being misrepresented by those who have not taken as much trouble to understand a point in dispute as one christian should do before he falls foul of another. One of my reviewers has represented me as denying the fulfilment of any prophecy unless it can be shewn precisely when, and where, and how, it was fulfilled. Such a charge requires no answer while the pamphlet exists to vindicate itself; but it has led me to think that some critic may charge me with having paradoxically put forth that the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse contain no figures, no symbols, no mysteries—all is literal and I understand it all. Be it so—the reader of common sense will see that I say no such thing—that I do in no degree deny the existence of mystery, but only maintain that it does not arise from a source to

which, in vague terms, it is very commonly ascribed—and affirm that whatever the mystery may be, it gives no colour for interpreting *days* to mean *years*, because it does not arise from, or consist in, any peculiar or *mystical use of words*.

As I am anxious, however, to be clearly understood, let me repeat, that the *things described* by Daniel and St. John were *figurative*; but that the *language of the description* is not so. Daniel saw a beast like a *Lion*—that *Lion* was figurative as afterwards appears; but there is nothing mystical or figurative in saying, “I saw “a beast like a *Lion*.” That beast, though otherwise like a *Lion*, had *Eagle’s wings*; this is a physical anomaly that might puzzle us if we saw the symbol, and which adds to the difficulty of explaining it; but the *words* are *plain*; and I believe no commentator understands that the words “eagle’s wings” mean any thing but what they import *literally*, though the wings which they describe were symbolical. Again, when St. John states that on the sounding of one of the Angels a star fell from heaven, that star might be figurative, its falling might be figurative, the heaven from which it fell, and the earth to which it fell, might be figurative also, and the symbol may be mysterious from our receiving only so general and imperfect a description or explanation, as not to be able to

decide with certainty what the things prefigured are; but there is no use of figurative language—no mystery of words, in saying, “the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven.” Every word is used in its common and obvious sense; and there is no mystical or figurative use of terms, as there was when our Lord said, “I am the *vine*”—“the good *shepherd*”—“the *door*”—“the *bread* of life”—“the *light* of the world”—as when St. Paul called Timothy his “*son*”—when St. James spoke of the tongue being “*set on fire*”—and St. Peter of a “*day star*” arising in the heart.

This is figurative language, and it abounds in the scriptures; but from such language, and from the unwonted and mystical use of words, I venture to say that the books of Daniel and the Apocalypse are peculiarly free. Yet, that they do contain it to such an extent as might reasonably lead us to expect that *any given word* is not to be taken in its *obvious sense*, is what has been insinuated, and what must be proved, if the argument is to be fairly brought into the field, in support of the mystical interpretation of *days* for *years*, *months* for periods of 30 *years*, and *years* for periods of 360 *years*. I venture to deny that *there are* analogies arising from the style of Daniel and the Apocalypse which will warrant such an interpretation.

The second argument, which the Reviewer

thinks has been inadequately noticed, is that which arises from "*the figurative dress of this very expression of time itself; such as time, times, and dividing of time.*"

In what sense the expression can be said to be *figurative*, I do not see: but I readily grant that, taken by itself, it might be, in some degree, indefinite. It occurs twice in Daniel (ch. vii. 25, and ch. xii. 7); but the words which our translators have rendered by "time," whatever affinity may exist between them, are not the same in those two passages.

In ch. vii. 25, the Chaldee word *ṛṛ* is used. It is found, I believe, no where but in the book of Daniel. On some occasions that writer uses it for *time* indefinitely; but it is generally admitted that he does not do so in the passage under consideration. There is another occasion (and, I believe, only one) in which he uses it to express a *definite* period, chap. iv. 16, 23, 25, 32; and there it is not doubted that the period intended is a year. Surely, if we are at a loss to know what definite period is meant in one place, we might expect to learn by referring to another passage in which a definite period is also clearly meant; and where the length of that period is not doubted. That this would be the course adopted by a reader who had no system to support, admits, I think, of no doubt; unless, indeed, he had been so impressed by vague

statements of the figurative and mysterious style of the prophet, as to have laid aside all common modes of proceeding.

The word used in ch. xii. 7, and also rendered "time" by our translators, is one much more common, and less indefinite. **מֵעַד**, according to Buxtorf, signifies "*Tempus statutum, vel constitutum, aut condictum.*" When it is used for "time," I believe it always means, a *set* or *appointed*, or, perhaps, more strictly, a *measured* time; and this, generally, a period measured by the heavenly bodies, which were originally appointed to be "for signs and for *seasons*, (**למַעַדִּים**) and for days and for years," Gen. i. 14. Hence, I suppose, it came to be applied to the Jewish festivals; and particularly to those which were *annual*. Thus, when the Jewish festivals are spoken of, we find "the sabbath, "the new moons, the *set feasts*," **מֵעַדִּים** I. Chron. xxiii. 31, II. Chron. ii. 4, (Heb. 3,) Isaiah i. 13, 14. In one place (Lev. xxiii. 2, 3, 34, 37,) it seems to be used for the feasts generally, so as to include the sabbath; but more commonly we find it distinguishing the *annual* feasts; and in some places with direct reference to them only. Thus, Ezekiel (xxxvi. 38) speaks of "the flock "of Jerusalem in her solemn feasts," **בְּמֵעַדֶיהָ**; and in II. Chron. viii. 13, we read "on the "sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the "*solemn feasts* (**וּלְמֵעַדֹתַי**), three times in the

“ year, even in the feast (בַּחֹג) of unleavened
 “ bread, and in the feast (בַּחֹג) of weeks, and in
 “ the feast (בַּחֹג) of tabernacles.”

Kircher (Concordance in v. מֵעַד, עַדָּה) says,
 “ Generaliter pro re aliqua certa, attestata, et
 “ definita accipitur. Et primum, pro tempore
 “ certo et constituto. Deinde pro festo seu so-
 “ lemmitate, quæ certo et stato tempore cele-
 “ bratur.” Thus the seventy have generally (I
 believe 57 times out of 69) translated it by
 καιρος^u or εσπρη, and never by χρονος.

For these reasons I think we might naturally
 conclude that Daniel meant, by the word which
 we translate indefinitely “ time,” a certain de-
 fined period; and perhaps we should be led
 from the common usage of the word, to suppose
 that he meant an *annual* period, in this place;
 and had a reference to, or might be said to cal-
 culate by, the periods of the solemn annual
 feasts, as he seems to have calculated by the
 sabbatical years in the prophecy of the seventy
 weeks, and by the daily sacrifices in the pro-
 phesy of the 2300 mornings and evenings.

Let us suppose, however, that the period, as
 stated by Daniel, was originally obscure, and

^u “ Καρος. 1. *Tempus, idque opportunum et conveniens,*
 “ *quo aliquid fieri solet et debet, opportunitas temporis, et ita*
 “ *differt proprie a χρονος quod tempus quodvis significat.*
 “ 2. *Tempus certum statutum et definitum.*” Schleusner in
 v. Καρος.

remained so until the New Testament; surely that contains enough to clear up the mystery. In Rev. xii. 14, the word *καιρος* is used and translated "time, and times, and half a time;" but in Rev. xi. 2, and xiii. 5, the period is stated (in very definite and intelligible words, which cannot be shewn, I believe, to have any where else an indefinite, figurative, or mystical meaning) to be "forty and two *months*;" and, in Rev. xi. 3, it is said to be "a thousand, two hundred "and threescore *days*,"^x Surely if the prophecy was obscure when it was first delivered; the obscurity, so far as regards the period in question, must have been removed by these plain declarations, or else it is difficult to imagine that it is in the power of language to remove it. If indeed, among many terms, any writer chooses to select *that one* which is *indefinite*, to call it *figurative*, to argue that therefore it is *mystical*, and to build his argument upon its individual obscurity, while he rejects the plain parallel passages which explain it, he may keep up an appearance of mystery, and maintain a system, but surely he is not in the way to elicit truth.

^x "Tempus quippe, et tempora, et dimidium temporis, "annum unum esse, et duos, et dimidium: ac per hoc tres "annos et semissem etiam *numero dierum posterius posito* "dilucescit, aliquando in Scripturis et mensium numero de- "claratur." Aug. de Civ. Dei, Lib. XX. c. xxiii.

The third argument which the Reviewer mentions appears to him to be a "very powerful" one. It is this—"The usages of chronological calculation in all nations, among none of whom, we believe, are large masses of time expressed in small fractional parts. It would be quite unusual to speak of a literal three years and a half as 1260 days; and if it is replied, that we must be prepared to expect an unusual mode of speaking under all the circumstances of the case, we wish only to go one step further, which will lead to the prophetic substitution of days for years."

I must frankly say, that this, which appears to the Reviewer to be a "*very powerful* argument," appears to me to be no argument at all; and, that it has been "inadequately noticed," if ever it has been thought of by any but himself, I am not prepared to admit. It seems to me to amount to this—"Here is a period which *prima facie* appears to consist of *three years and a half*, mentioned in terms of *days*; it is a very strange thing—contrary to all usages of chronological calculation in all nations." Well, suppose that, for the sake of argument, we grant that the thing is most strange and unheard of, what does the Reviewer propose? Any doubt of the genuineness of the text? Not the least. Any thing more common, more usual? No such thing. With ad-

mirable coolness he proposes to go "a step farther." Having been brought so far out of the common way by force, he seems to think it quite unreasonable to grudge him "one step farther," (a long one I think,) for which (as far as this argument is concerned) he assigns no reason, but that he "wishes" to take it.

Let the matter be as contrary as it may to "the usages of chronical calculation," surely the case is not mended by supposing the days to be years. If it would be strange to find three years and a half spoken of as 1260 days, surely it would be stranger still, and more contrary to all known "usages of chronical calculation," to speak of 1260 *years* as 1260 *days*, or *forty-two months*, or *three times and a half*. How long a step the Reviewer may wish to take I really know not; but it must carry him to some point not obvious, I think, to most readers, if it "*leads*" to the substitution which he maintains. Whatever difficulty there may be in the text, I cannot see that it contains any indication that we are to relieve ourselves from that difficulty by such an interpretation.

We may generally either find or make a mystery in plain words, if we desire it; but really it does not seem to me so very wonderful that a period of such importance should be stated in various terms of years, months, and days; and when I find such "masses of time" as 150

days,⁷ and 180 days,⁸ I do not feel incredulous that *days* may be *days*, though the number be 1260.

The Reviewer adds, "and in truth *through-out* scripture we *often* find words thus used in "a *large sense*, the specific mensuration of which "must be adjusted by the scope of the passage." To this I am not prepared to reply, because I really know not what the Reviewer means. I do not think "we often find words "thus used," and if he has found such, I wish he had specified them. I submit to his own judgment whether (on grounds wholly distinct from the present argument) such assertions should be made in broad and general terms, without any limitation, explanation, or any specific reference to examples.

There is another passage in this Review which I wish to notice, because it seems to be calculated to convey a very erroneous impression. After having spoken of Mr. Irving's suggestion, in his Preface to the work of Lacunza, that the days may be both figurative and literal, an idea which Mr. Irving seems to have been led to form by the "strong case" which Lacunza had made out for the literal interpretation, the Reviewer adds—

"If Mr. Irving had not since advanced many still more

⁷ Gen. vii. 24.

⁸ Esth. i. 4.

“startling propositions, we might be induced to dwell
“for a moment upon this; but if we once begin with
“this gifted, but erratic, author’s peculiarities, where
“must we end? We therefore decline all comment;
“our only object in adducing the reference being to
“shew that Mr. Maitland, in *his* ‘strong case,’ does
“not stand alone; though he probably little expected
“to find an ally in Mr. Irving’s Spanish friend, and
“still less, to the above extent, a partial one even in
“Mr. Irving himself.” P. 400.

I am unwilling to imagine that the Reviewer intended to impose on the simplicity of his readers, or meant, by dishonest artifice, to discredit the doctrine, as one held by an obscure individual *almost* “alone,” and who would catch at such allies as Mr. Irving and Lacunza. But if he was honest, and I do believe he was, by what course of reading has he prepared himself for the censorship which he exercises? Certainly I had no suspicion that I should “stand “alone,” while I was defending what I believe to have been the doctrine of the whole Christian church for more than twelve centuries; and, strange as it may seem to the Reviewer, I certainly did expect “Mr. Irving’s Spanish friend” to hold the doctrine, which has been maintained, as far as I know, by every writer of his church (except Pastorini) from the time of St. Peter to the present hour. Nor indeed should I have felt that I stood quite alone in disputing an opinion which had already been denied by at

least twenty protestant writers.* There are those who conceive that whatever is new to them is absolutely new; and they are now most powerful opponents; because I am quite confident that we may do more towards preventing the fair discussion of a doctrine, by representing it as a "new conceit" of an obscure person, than by shewing that it actually involves a dangerous heresy. I have already said, and I can say sincerely, that I do not charge the Reviewer with any such base purpose; and this I do because, from other parts of his article, he appears to be in real ignorance of the history of the controversy. While I feel it a duty to expose this ignorance, I do it without any personal feeling of ill-will, for I have not the slightest idea who the writer of the article may be; and certainly, as far as regards myself and my pamphlet, he has spoken very civilly. He adds, however, p. 400—

" We should not, indeed, be much surprised if some of
" those interpreters who are exploding all notion of the
" figurative and spiritual meaning of scripture, as re-
" lates to the restoration of the Jews, the millennial
" reign of Christ, and other kindred points,—who see
" in the new heavens and the new earth, literally only
" the present earth newly modified, and who can find
" nothing in scripture of what we old-fashioned Chris-
" tians call ' heaven,'—should in the end take up the

* See before, p. 37.

“ literal interpretation of the 1260 days, and eventually
“ set aside, not only the old-established landmarks,
“ but even much that has of later years been so confi-
“ dently asserted respecting Buonaparte, the French
“ Revolution, the late war, the immediate coming of
“ Christ, and many other modern applications of pro-
“ phesy.”

Now, except so far as regards what really are
“ the old-established landmarks,” and his class-
ing the doctrine of the immediate coming of
Christ among “ *modern* applications of prophe-
“ cy,”^b I perfectly agree with the Reviewer.
As to the removal of old-established landmarks,
the charge lies not, I think, against the party
to whom he alludes, so far as respects the doc-
trines which he notices ; for I believe that, *on*
those points, very few of them have put forth
opinions which cannot be shewn to have been
generally held in the Christian church at an
earlier period than the contrary opinions ; but,
at all events, it lies not against those who op-
pose the doctrine of the 1260 years, which I
think cannot be shewn to have existed until
those who separated from the church of Rome
were determined to prove the Pope to be Anti-
christ, and made up this mystical interpretation
to meet the exigency of the case. But I must

^b I presume that the Reviewer does not mean to insinuate
that the primitive church did not expect the “ immediate
“ coming of Christ.”

go farther than the Reviewer. I not only "should not wonder" if these writers should "take up" this interpretation of the 1260 days, but I fully expect that they will do it; and am truly surprised that they have not done it already. It is obvious that I must disagree with them on many points; but there is perhaps scarcely one among them whom I have not to thank for teaching me something which I did not know before; and I do really anticipate that some of them at least will, one of these days, thank me for pointing out what is perhaps the only *material* error respecting the points here referred to, which they will have to confess. In the mean time I wish just to suggest to them, that, while they are, in most of the cases alluded to, restoring the "old-established landmarks," they are, *in this case*, maintaining "a modern application of prophecy," which by no means accords with their general (and, I believe, just) system of literal interpretation.

REMARKS

ON A

REVIEW IN THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER,

FOR DECEMBER, 1826.

There is one point in this review which appears to require some notice, because it would seem to imply, that in my first Enquiry I had evaded the difficulty of my subject, and only imperfectly stated the arguments of those whom I opposed.

The Reviewer says—

“ We profess to hold a large portion of Mr. Faber’s
“ writings in high estimation, and we should be ex-
“ tremely concerned to detract from his well-merited
“ reputation. We think, however, it is saying too
“ much to affirm that the specified dissertation puts
“ the reader ‘ in full possession of the subject;’ and
“ are particularly surprised at his adding, that it con-
“ tains ‘ all the arguments’ he recollects to have seen
“ in favour of the contested mode of interpretation,
“ when, in p. 51, he mentions five other writers, even
“ styled by himself ‘ eminent writers,’ one of whom,
“ Mr. Holmes, has supported it by a chain of argu-

“mentation, which appears to us entirely new, and to
“which we are sorry, therefore, that we can only re-
“fer, as it is too long for quotation, and would be
“materially weakened by abridgement. See his Ful-
“filment of the Revelation of St. John displayed,
“p. 205.”

Any reader who will take the trouble to turn to the 51st page of my former Enquiry will see that I never called Mr. Holmes an “eminent writer;” but that I merely quoted a passage from Mr. Gauntlett, in which he bestows that epithet on five commentators. Surely no careful and candid reader would consider such a quotation as involving a profession that I knew any thing of the writers specified, or meant to give any opinion on their merits. In fact, I had never seen Mr. Holmes’s work; and did not suppose, nor do I now believe, that it had acquired such a circulation and authority in England (whatever may be the case in Ireland) as would have warranted my classing it with the works of Mr. Faber, Mr. Frere, and Mr. Cunninghame; and I must still affirm that, as far as I can see, the extracts from Mr. Faber’s work do put the reader in “full possession of “the subject,” (that subject being the simple question of whether days are natural days or years;) and that they do contain all the arguments which I had seen in favour of the contested mode of interpretation.

When, however, I heard of a new "chain of argumentation," I was really curious to see it; and felt that it would be my duty to examine it impartially. I therefore procured Mr. Holmes's work, which had never before fallen in my way; but, on turning to the page referred to by the Reviewer, I could find nothing at all to the purpose; and it seemed evident that he must have quoted from a different edition, (if there is more than one,) or else that there must be an error in the reference. I can honestly say, that I took a good deal of trouble in looking, and could only find the following passage on the point in question. Whether it is that to which the Reviewer meant to refer I really do not know; but I suppose it is not, as it is quite short enough to have been quoted in the review. I shall, however, lay it before the reader; premising that without intending to give any opinion as to its originality, I am much mistaken if it is argument.

"A Day.—No period accurately resembles a day but a
" year. The daily revolution of the earth round its
" axis, resembles its yearly revolution in its orbit round
" the sun; the great divisions of day and night re-
" semble the summer and winter, the two great di-
" visions of the year: and the four quarters of a day,
" continually melting into and succeeding each other,
" of morning, forenoon, afternoon, and evening, re-
" semble the four quarters of the year, spring, summer,



“ autumn, and winter. ON THESE ACCOUNTS, a day,
“ in prophetic language, signifies a year.” Vol. I.
p. 26.

I do not know that this review contains any
thing else to which an answer may not be found
in some part or other of this Enquiry.

REMARKS

ON A

REVIEW IN THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN,

FOR FEBRUARY, 1827.

When I was preparing this second Enquiry, (which has been delayed by unexpected circumstances much longer than I anticipated,) I was desirous to correct what might be erroneous, and to supply what was defective, in the first. Some remarks in the Christian Guardian led me to address the following letter to the Editor:—

“ SIR,

“ When you did me the favour to notice a pamphlet
“ which I lately published, containing an enquiry into the
“ grounds on which the prophetic period of Daniel and St.
“ John has been supposed to consist of 1260 years, your
“ Reviewer observed—‘ He disposes of the arguments in
“ favour of this interpretation with considerable ingenuity,
“ but has not brought forward any *evidence of its being*
“ *erroneous.*’

“ I trust you will not think me insensible of the civility
“ with which you have treated me, or inclined to cavil at

“ words, if I take the liberty, through you, to request of
“ the Reviewer some idea of the nature of the evidence
“ which might have been expected from me. It seems to
“ me, that where the question is simply, whether certain
“ words are to be taken literally, the whole burthen of
“ proof lies upon those who depart from the literal interpretation; and that the literal interpretation is fully established by simply *disposing of the arguments* in favour of
“ any other.

“ I am not writing with a view to controvert the statement of your Reviewer, or I should venture to suggest that some points which I noticed, such as the great and fundamental differences of expositors—the ignorance openly avowed by the church in general, as to *how*, and even *whether*, these prophecies have been fulfilled—the absence of appeal in controversy to *these fulfilments* of prophecy, as grounds of Christian faith, are evidence that the system is erroneous. But my object in troubling you at this time is not to vindicate myself, but simply to obtain information. I am engaged in preparing a second Enquiry, and it is my wish to notice in it whatever objections have been made to the first; and, as far as in me lies, to supply such deficiencies as have been pointed out. I feel it therefore a duty to apply to whatever quarter may afford any hope of assistance; and I should be unwilling to appear again before the public, unless I could shew that I had used due diligence to obtain information.”
“ 7th Feb. 1828.”

Having received no farther answer to this letter, than an assurance from the Editor that it had been transmitted to the Reviewer, I know not what evidence was expected or would be admitted; but, even under this disadvan-

tage, I will set down what I consider as positive evidence against the system of the 1260 years in general; though, as I have before said, I think that after an admission that I have "disposed of the arguments in favour of the "interpretation," it is almost needless to bring forward direct arguments against it. I am, however, anxious to meet every objection; and I had rather be guilty of some degree of repetition than subject myself to the appearance of tacit evasion. I shall therefore very briefly state what I believe to be positive arguments against the system of the 1260 years; and if it should appear that most of them might be collected from various parts of these Enquiries, yet, perhaps, some advantage will arise from a succinct statement of them in a collective form. I shall not pretend to say that they "*prove*" the system to be erroneous; because, though I am sensible that big words have a great effect upon careless readers, yet I have generally found that those who use them are, in the long run, obliged to undergo a process of qualification, which, however ingeniously they may manage it, does neither them nor their system any credit; while it is unspeakably injurious to the cause of truth. I say nothing, then, about *proofs*, but will merely state the arguments which appear to me to shew that the system is erroneous.

I. I think it is wrong, in these passages, to translate "*days*" by "*years*," "*months*" by thirties of years, and "*times*" by periods of 360 years, because, as far as I can find, it would be wrong to do so any where else. I can find no place where the word *day* stands for *year*; and I believe it has not been attempted to make it do so in any other prophecy, or writing, except by some commentators on the ten days in the second chapter of the Apocalypse, of which I have spoken elsewhere; and by some who make our Lord's declaration, that he should himself be three days, and three nights, in the heart of the earth, refer to his ministry in Judea, of whom, perhaps, it is not necessary to speak at all. If it would be wrong every where else, I presume it would be wrong here, unless special reasons can be assigned. Why is a word to be mystical *here* that is not so elsewhere? and why are we to suppose a mode of stating a space of time which we confess is never adopted elsewhere? To borrow words from Mr. Faber, "I cannot but think that such a mode of exposition as this accords very ill with the *definite simplicity* for which the prophecies of Daniel are so remarkable."^c I agree with him in thinking, that "the only manner in which prophecy can

^c Vol. I. 366.

“ be *satisfactorily* explained is by strictly adhering to its plain, unvarnished, declarations.”^a An interpretation which requires such a deviation from the obvious and literal meaning of plain words, must be supported by particular arguments, and rests on their strength; to dispose of them is to settle the question.

II. Familiarly as even the most superficial readers have now learned to talk of the “prophetic style” of a “day for a year,” I believe that any such interpretation of the prophetic period of Daniel (or of any other period) was altogether unknown by the Jewish church before the Christian æra—by the Apostles of our Lord—by the primitive church—by the Fathers—in short, that no man ever thought of interpreting the days mystically, or that any period of 1260 years was marked out, during (to say the very least) the first twelve centuries of Christianity. I know that this proud age looks with pity or contempt on all that have preceded it; and such a reference to the unvarying interpretation of the Christian Church may only provoke a smile.* Still, notwithstanding the march of intellect, I cannot help thinking that

^a Vol. I. 372.

* Scaliger said, “ Quidquid ante quadraginta annos scriptum est in Apocalypsim, tout cela ne vaut rien.” Scaligerana, 2da. p. 15.

there were *some* among the various classes which I have specified, who understood the prophetic style quite as well as we do. They, however, (as far as I know, universally) expected an individual Antichrist, who should persecute the saints, *as* saints, during a period of three years and a half; and I believe that opinion would never have been departed from, if some of the Reformers, with more zeal than knowledge, had not determined that the Pope *must* be Antichrist; and as the Pope did not suit the terms of the prophecy, they resolved that the terms of the prophecy should be so interpreted as to suit the Pope.^f

^f I have not seen the mystical interpretation of the days in the works of any writer before the time of Walter Brute, who says, in his declaration given in to the Bishop of Hereford, about A.D. 1390—"The abomination, that is the
 "idol, of desolation was placed of Adrian, in the last
 "destruction in Jerusalem, in the holy place, that is to say,
 "in a place of the Temple. And from that time hitherto
 "have passed near about 1290 days, taking a day for a
 "year, as Daniel takes it in his prophecies, and other prop-
 "hets likewise. For Daniel, speaking of 62 weeks, doth
 "not speak of the weeks of days, but of years. So, there-
 "fore, when he saith, from the time that the continual
 "sacrifice was taken away, &c. 1290 days must be taken
 "for so many years, from the time of the desolation of
 "Jerusalem, even unto the revealing of Antichrist; and
 "not for three years and a half, which they say Antichrist
 "shall reign. And again, whereas Daniel said, 'how long
 "till the end of these marvellous matters?' It was an-

III. I have already mentioned the great and striking difference of opinion which exists

“swered him, ‘for a time, and times, and half a time.’
 “Behold also how unfitly they did assign this time by three
 “years and a half, which they say Antichrist shall reign.
 “For when as it is said, a time, times, and half a time,
 “there is a going downward from the greater to the less;
 “from the whole to the part, because it is from a time to
 “half a time. If, therefore, there be a going downward
 “from the whole to the part, by the midst (which is
 “greater than the whole itself) the going downward is not
 “meet nor agreeing. And this is done when as it is said
 “that a time, times, and half a time, is a year, two years,
 “and half a year. Wherefore more fitly it is said that a
 “time, times, and half a time doth signify 1290 years, as is
 “said in the chapter preceding.” The passage referred to
 is one in which the author is endeavouring to shew, that by
 the seclusion of the woman in the wilderness was prefigured
 the maintenance of Christianity in England, which he con-
 sidered as having been then maintained for about 1260
 years. He says—“In saying for a time, times, and half a
 “time, there is a going forward from the greater to the less.
 “The greater time that we name is 1000 years, there is a
 “time; and the next time that is less in the singular num-
 “ber is 100 year. In the plural number, times signify that
 “there be more hundreds than one, at least 200 years.
 “Wherefore, if they be put under a certain number, it must
 “needs be that they be two, but the same cannot fitly be
 “called some times, except they be hundreds. For in that
 “there is a going down from the greater to the less, when
 “as it is said, ‘a time, times, and half a time,’ and that
 “the number of 1000 is likely assigned for a time: it must
 “needs follow that times must be taken for hundreds, and
 “half a time for 60, because it is the greater half of a hun-

among those who maintain the system of the 1260 years; and I have met with a fresh instance of it since the former Enquiry was printed.

One of my Reviewers seems to think that I have done less than justice in saying so much of Mr. Faber, and so little of Mr. Holmes.* The simple fact is, that I was not acquainted with Mr. Holmes's work, or at all aware that he was considered as one of the leading writers on the subject. If, however, he is, let us see how far he agrees with the rest; and for this purpose it will be fairest to quote his own words, "The explanation of the first and third seals; of Rev. vii.; of the beginning of Rev. viii.; of the second and third trumpets; of Rev. x. and xv.; of the first, second, and fifth vials; and of the *whole prophecy from the xviii. chapter*, are, I believe, ENTIRELY NEW; and the elucidations of Rev. xii. and xiv. may almost be included in this last, as they but faintly

"dred years, though that 50 be the even half."—Fox's Mart. vol. I. 444, 443. The argument has been a good deal improved since the days of Walter Brute.

* "We think that Mr. Faber, with every concession to his real merits, as the magnus Achilles of prophetic commentators, should not have been put forward as their single representative; and that something more was due to Mr. Holmes, and his fellow labourers, than the mere introduction of their names."—Chr. Exam. Dec. 1826.

“*resemble* the illustrations of these prophecies
“ heretofore published.”^h

In my former publication I mentioned particularly Mr. Faber, Mr. Frere, and Mr. Cuninghame, because I supposed that their works were best known and most popular; if, however, Mr. Holmes has a claim to be placed with them, I can have no objection, and certainly meant no offence. Mr. Croly too, whose work has been published, I believe, since I wrote, has, perhaps, a right to be classed among the popular interpreters of the day; and it may be sufficient for the present purpose to quote his advertisement, which I reprint from a newspaper, with its own capitals and italics:—

NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

This Day is Published, in one vol. 8vo.—Price 12s in boards,

THE APOCALYPSE of Sr. JOHN, or Prophecy of the
Rise, Progress, and Fall of the Church of Rome; the In-
quisition; the Revolution of France; the Universal War; and
Final Triumph of Christianity. Being a new interpretation.

By the Rev. GEORGE CROLY, A.M. H.R.S.L.

“The real fact is,” said Mr. Faber, “that
“ with the exception of Grotius and Hammond,
“ and *one or two* who have followed them, there
“ is NO DISCREPANCY among protestant exposi-
“ tors with regard to the great outlines of pro-
“ phetic interpretation.” After quoting this
passage, and another of similar import from
Mr. Cuninghame, one of my reviewers says—

^h Preface to Fulfilment of the Revelation displayed.

“ These bold assertions stand in no need of refutation. It is indeed true that certain great outlines of the Revelation itself are so broad and palpable that they cannot be mistaken ; and a plain unlettered reader of his bible, who had never dipped into a commentator, would be at little loss to understand the general scope of the prophecy. A very small portion of information would further enable him to refer the seat of the harlot to the city of Rome; and he would form some plausible conjectures, perhaps, as to some other features of the prophecy. *But at the point from which expository interpretation sets out, discrepancy begins.* Expositors are agreed as to the outlines, which stand in no need of their labours, and no further. They can therefore take no credit for agreement among themselves so far; and beyond those unquestionable waymarks of interpretation, we may ask, *on what single point are they agreed?*”¹ I really believe it would be a matter of difficulty to point out *one*. Mr. Faber, after having stated the arguments for the existence of such a period as the 1260 years, goes on to say—“ The argument has hitherto been conducted chiefly with reference to the Romanists, who for obvious reasons maintain that the latter

¹ Eclectic Review, April, 1827, p. 324.

“ three times and a half are no more than three
 “ literal years and a half: for protestant expo-
 “ sitors are *sufficiently*^k agreed that they must
 “ be years of years; or, in other words, they
 “ are sufficiently agreed that the three times
 “ and a half, the forty-two months, and the
 “ 1260 days, must alike be equivalent to 1260
 “ years. But here a second question arises.”
 No doubt it does; for the foundation is not yet
 laid, and after making *day* mean *year*, we must,
 in some way or other, make *year* signify two
 different periods.^l On this point, however,
 protestant commentators are not “ sufficiently
 “ agreed;” and it becomes necessary for Mr.
 Faber to notice the opinion maintained by Mr.
 Fleming, Mr. Marshall, and Bishop Lloyd, in

^k It may be difficult to say what is a “ sufficient” agree-
 ment in such a case. But a doctrine which has been op-
 posed by so many, even among protestant divines, is not to
 be treated as an indisputable truth. I have already men-
 tioned several, though probably nothing like all, the pro-
 testant commentators who do not admit that the years of
 Daniel and St. John must be years of years.—See before,
 page 37.

^l Perhaps the uninitiated reader would hardly suspect
 that when Mr. Faber, and many other writers, speak of
 “ years of years,” they use the word *year* to express two
 different periods, and mean “ *years*” (consisting of 360
 mystical days) “ of years” (consisting of 365 natural days).
 I do not understand how this is reconciled with the rules of
 homogeneity.

opposition to Mr. Mede, Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and other commentators. I need not say that when the maintainers of this system have chosen that sort of year which they think best, they cannot at all agree from what point of time to begin their reckoning; for I have already shewn that they fix upon various periods during more than three centuries. To follow these discrepancies, which now branch off into endless variety, would be useless; but I call upon the reader to observe how far anything like a general agreement is carried beyond the one single assertion, that there is a certain period of 1260 years (of some sort or other—containing either 360 or 365 days), and which began at some period or another either in the fifth, sixth, seventh, or eighth centuries.

Now, when I state that this great discrepancy leads me to suspect some error common to all these systems, I am not speaking only my own sentiments. What Mr. Scott has said respecting one part of the subject, I feel, indeed, to apply to all, “The different opinions of eminently learned and able men on the subject, and the extreme difficulty which they seem to find in making one part of their interpretations consistent with the others, are powerful arguments in my mind that they have not fact and truth to bear them out.”^m Dr.

^m Comm. Rev. xi. 7-12.

Adam Clarke, in the Preface to his Commentary on the Revelation, after specifying the various systems of interpretation which have been maintained, adds—"My readers may naturally expect that I should either give a decided preference to some one of the opinions stated above, or produce one of my own: I can do neither; nor can I pretend to explain the book; I do not understand it; and in the things which concern so sublime and awful a subject, I dare not, as my predecessors, indulge in *conjectures*. I have read elaborate works on the subject, and each seemed right till another was examined: I am satisfied that no *certain mode of interpreting* the prophecies of this book has yet been found out; and I will not add another monument to the liteness or folly of the human mind by endeavouring to strike out a new course. I repeat it, I do not understand the book; and I am satisfied that not one who has written on the subject knows any thing more of it than myself: I should, perhaps, except J. E. Clarke, who has written on the number of the Beast. His interpretation amounts nearly to demonstration; but that is but a small part of the difficulties of the Apocalypse."

I cannot better express the opinion which has been forced upon my own mind, than in the words of a writer in the Eclectic Review;

he says—"When we reflect on the number and
 "talents of the men who have attempted to
 "illustrate the visions of St. John, and the
 "great discordance of opinions, it would seem
 "as if there *must be* something *radically* wrong,
 "some *fatal error*, at the *very foundation* of ALL
 "their systems of explanation, which is one
 "great cause of the mistakes and confusion
 "that appear to pervade them all. *What this*
 "*is deserves to be maturely considered,*"^a Whose
 language this is, I know not; but I wonder that
 the same view has not forced itself on all who
 have reflected on the subject. I believe, how-
 ever, that the fundamental error was long ago
 pointed out by Bengel, and that he was quite
 right when he said—"He who has once laid
 "aside the prejudice of the *year-day*, will find
 "out the *root* of most of the forced interpreta-
 "tions."^o

IV. The fourth point which I would mention
 is the want of conviction which appears to me
 to exist in the Christian church, and the very
 little *real belief* which *any* system of interpreting
 the supposed period of 1260 years has obtained.
 Surely, if any one of these had been Aaron's
 rod it would have swallowed up the others by

^a Vol IV. New Series. Oct. 1815.

^o Introduction to the Exposition of the Apocalypse
 translated by Robertson, p. 147.

this time. Surely it would have wrought something like "general conviction." Instead of that, system after system appears—each has, perhaps, those who read it and admire its ingenuity or its learning—but, I can honestly say, that, to the best of my recollection, I have never found that *any one* system of interpretation had carried a conviction of its truth to the mind of *any individual* whom I have questioned on the subject. I have been in the habit of enquiring on this point; and I have not yet met with a person who was prepared to say of any system, "I am satisfied that it is the right one." I frequently hear the reading of such works recommended. If I then ask the opinion of him who recommends, he tells me, perhaps, that he thinks it very ingenious;—but when I come to the point, and enquire, "Are you satisfied with it yourself? do you rest in a conviction that it gives the real meaning of the prophecies?" there is sure to be a change of tone—"Why, really, there seems to be a great degree of probability about a considerable part of it—this or that part is very satisfactory—he shews incontrovertibly that Mr. — is quite wrong in his interpretation of the trumpets, or the vials, or the witnesses—I really think it is a very able work and well worthy of attention." "Well, but are you satisfied that so far as it professes to give the meaning

“ of the prophecies, it does, generally speaking, “ give the *real* meaning ?”—“ Why, really, I “ should think it highly probable that, in a “ considerable degree, it does so—but I should “ wish to speak cautiously, and, in fact, I have “ not studied the subject sufficiently myself to “ give a decided opinion.” Now this is not the language of conviction. It is not such language as I should expect to hear from the great body of the Christian Church respecting prophecies fulfilled more than a thousand years ago, or actually fulfilling before their eyes. It is not the language which the same persons use with regard to other prophecies which they believe to have been fulfilled—such as those relating to the first advent of our Lord, to the dispersion of the Jews, to the ruin of Babylon, Nineveh, and Tyre. There is, in the Christian Church, a full and hearty conviction, that these prophecies have been fulfilled by certain facts, respecting which christians are generally agreed. The same conviction exists respecting other prophecies, with regard to the fulfilment of which the precise period or circumstances are not equally clear (such as the return from Babylon and the seventy weeks); but with regard to the prophecies supposed to have been fulfilled during the 1260 years, I can neither find a general, nor an individual, conviction of the truth of *any* interpretation which has yet been given. I ex-

cept, of course, the authors of the various systems; who, I doubt not, conscientiously believe what they write. It is obvious too, that I can only speak of what I have found in my own sphere; the reader may perhaps find it different in his. I wish that these hints may lead him to enquire.

V. When prophecies, which are known to have been in existence for centuries, are being fulfilled before the eyes of men, is not an appeal to them “the readiest way to convince every reasonable man of the truth of revelation.” So Bishop Newton (the words of whose dedication I borrow) considered it; and so it is, as far as I know, considered by writers on the evidences of Christianity. They invariably, I believe, point the infidel to that great and striking fulfilment of prophecy, “now before his eyes,” the dispersion and state of the Jews; but I have not met with any writer who has argued on the fulfilments of prophecy supposed to have taken place in our own age, and predicted by the seals, trumpets, and vials.^p

^p One of my reviewers says—“Bishop Newton, whose dissertations on the prophecies were, as we learn from the dedication, expressly written for the conviction of infidels, considers an appeal to those of recent fulfilment as the most eligible, because it cannot possibly be said that they were ‘framed after the events;’ and though he

The infidel to whom Bishop Newton proposed this mode of proof was "startled," and "said" "he must acknowledge, that if this point could" "be proved to satisfaction, there would be no" "arguing against such plain matter of fact; it" "would certainly convince him, and he believed" "it would be the readiest way to convince" "every reasonable man of the truth of revelation." Yet I believe that Mr. Faber himself, in his work on "The Difficulties of Infidelity," has made no mention of the 1260 years, though he has a section on fulfilled prophecy, as constituting one of those "difficulties."

VI. A sixth argument against the system may be drawn from some consequences which appear to arise out of its adoption. For the present I will confine myself to the notice of one.

This system requires those who hold it to maintain that the passages in Daniel which re-

"could not in his day direct their attention to the French Revolution, later writers have not failed to do so."—Chr. Examiner, p. 454. My reviewer may, and should, have a more extensive knowledge of the subject than I possess; and therefore I shall not contradict his assertion; but as he has not specified any works "expressly written for the conviction of infidels," which "direct their attention to the French Revolution," I must say that it is only on his testimony that I know of their existence.

late to the Little Horn, and the parallel passages in the Apocalypse, have been fulfilled by the Pope or the Papacy.

Let us briefly enquire how far history will warrant this application of the prophecy.

1. Can it be truly said that "the saints" have ever been delivered into the hands of the Pope, or the Papacy, in such a way, for such a purpose, and with such a consequence, as the words of the prophecy plainly require?

Here a very material question arises—namely, what are we to understand by the word "saints?" for it appears to me that the system which applies the prediction to the Papacy, owes whatever plausibility it possesses to a very convenient mode of making the same word signify two very different sets of persons.

When "the saints" are delivered into the hands of the Little Horn, we are (according to these interpreters) to understand the *visible church*; and, in order to maintain this fulfilment, the *universal* spiritual dominion of the Pope is insisted on.

When, however, "the saints" are made war upon, and worn out, we are required to understand the *maintainers of true religion*, as contradistinguished from those who just before were

“the saints ;” but who are *now* the servants of the Little Horn, and employed by him in persecuting “the saints”—that is, the *spiritual church*, cast out from, and persecuted by, the *visible church*.

Having thus two different, and actually opposed, sets of persons to whom we may apply the title indifferently, as occasion requires, we may keep up appearances ; but surely, if we take the plain language of scripture, we must understand that “the saints” are some one body—delivered into the hands of their persecutor in that corporate capacity—and persecuted by him *generally*, and as a *body*, and *because* they are saints.

Without denying that the title might have been used to designate either the *visible church* of Christ, or the *spiritual church*, as contradistinguished from it, I do venture to maintain that it cannot mean both. Let us see how far it is, in fact, applicable to either.

- Let us suppose it to mean the *visible church*.
- Surely it never was universally given into the hands of the Papacy. It is strange that one should need to affirm this, while there are ecclesiastical histories in existence. It is a strange thing to exclude the millions of the Greek Church from the title of “saints,” *because* they *resisted* the Little Horn ; and to restrict that title to those who became his *pro-*

fessed subjects. Surely the Greek Church is, and always has been, too important to be passed over as it is by the interpreters of prophecy. It is, beyond all comparison, the church next in magnitude to the church of Rome; and that one which, in point of antiquity and extent of claim, comes most naturally into competition and comparison with it.

Let it pass, however—we will suppose that it was too insignificant to form an exception, or think afterwards of some reason for ridding ourselves of it just at present. But how can it be maintained, with any thing like gravity, that the visible church is *now* in the hands of the Pope? I will not inquire what is his real authority over those who are professedly of his own communion; but I ask, how can we talk of “the church” being in his hands, when the number of Christians who reject his claim to supremacy, who openly defy him to his face, and over whom he does not pretend to have any sort of control, is nearly as great as the whole number of his professed and nominal followers? ^a

Well—let us get over this, and, for the sake

^a I say this on the authority of a statement which appeared in the *Missionary Register* for January, 1828—in which the number of Roman Catholics is set down at 129,550,000, and that of Christians not in communion with the Church of Rome, at 105,345,000.

of argument, suppose that, by a figure of speech, a part is put for the whole, and that a *sufficient* number of "the saints" were delivered into the hands of the Pope—did he set to work to make war upon them? Did he make it his business to exterminate them? Not that ever I heard of. When we get to this part of the argument, and feel how impossible it is to pretend that the Pope has ever "made war" upon the *visible church*, and "worn it out," we begin to be in want of the other sense of the term. "The saints" can be allowed to be saints no longer.

Let us then take the word "saints" in its restricted meaning. I do not know that Mr. Faber expressed any thing but the common opinion when he said that, on the Pope's obtaining universal supremacy, the saints of God "were made the vassals of the man of sin; and" "were, in consequence of it, soon reduced to" "a state of worse than Egyptian bondage." I must say that, if this is true, it did not fulfil the prophecy, which foretels not the *bondage*, but the *destruction* of the "saints." There is nothing in the prophecy which predicts, or which seems to me compatible with, the *vassalage* of the saints. The part assigned them in the scriptures is open, uncompromising, and steadfast resistance to the peremptory command of a tyrant. He makes no offer of *servitude*, nor

could they accept it if he did—they are to obey, or to die—they resist, and are slain. It does seem to me utterly repugnant to all that is revealed on the subject, to imagine that the “spiritual church” of Christ should ever be *servants* (whether willingly or by constraint) of the Little Horn, the Man of Sin, or the Apocalyptic Beast.

Now, is it pretended that when the saints were delivered into the hands of the Pope, they did make this resistance? did he make war upon them? Did he persecute them in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, or eleventh centuries? No—they did not resist, nor did he make war upon them and wear them out. Then came the Albigenses, and he did make war upon them, and did wear them out.* Their history is short and simple; and, however unpopular it may be to say so of a people whose sufferings have excited so much interest and

* “Bellum autem isthoc non statim ab initio suo gessit
 “Bestia, sed postquam jam ad ἀρχήν suam pervenerat, cur-
 “rente seculo a Christo nato duodecimo. *Prima* ejus ex-
 “peditio incubuit in Albigenses et Waldenses, et si quo
 “alio nomine tunc appellati sint veri Christi cultores.”
 Mede, p. 503. So that, according to Mede, “the saints”
 were followers of the Man of Sin for more than five hundred
 years, without resistance on their part, or persecution on his.
 I wish the reader would turn to the plain words of scripture,
 and see if this can be admitted as a fulfilment. If it can, I
 think we may make what we please of the prophecies.

claim so much compassion, yet I must say, their simple history is this—they took the sword and they perished by the sword. I do not mean to speak uncharitably of them. Their conduct was that of men—perhaps of heroes and patriots—but not of martyrs. Every principle of my own corrupt nature would have led me to join their ranks, rather than to have knelt with Stephen; but the rule of Christ is plain and unqualified, and whatever title we may give to him who dies with a sword in his hand, we cannot call him a martyr. But, when they were destroyed, was the spiritual church “worn out,” or even subjugated? Did it not seem from that time to arise and shine and put on strength? And what has been its history ever since? Has the Papacy been “practising and prospering?” No.—I venture to say that from the time when the Pope began to persecute the spiritual Church of Christ, his power has waned, and notwithstanding all his “practising” he has never “prospered.”¹

¹ F. Turretin, after tracing the Papacy through its various stages, and placing its *ακμή* “*in teterrimis Papatus tenebris a Gregorio VII. usque ad Lutheri Reformationem*,” adds that we may see it, “*εν παρακμῃ ut decrescentem et cadentem ab illo tempore*,” and he quotes the following passage from Bellarmine, “*Ab eo tempore, quo per vos Papa Antichristus esse cœpit, non crevit ipsius imperium, sed semper magis ac magis decrevit.*” *De necess. Success. nostra ab Ecc. Rom. Disp. VII. § xv.*

The Church of Christ upon earth is in a depressed condition; and ever must be until she is purified and made ready as the Bride of the Lamb. Since the day that the Bridegroom was taken away, she has had need to mourn his absence, and to humble herself in sackcloth, for the many corruptions and imperfections which have ever abounded. She is weak and impure, for such are all her members. She is "in the wilderness," and must tarry there till she finds one to lean on who may bring her up: but to talk of the Church of Christ as being in the wilderness, or of her witnesses prophesying in sackcloth, *because* of the dominant apostacy of the church of Rome—or *because* of the warfare of the Pope—either *now*, or for by far the greater part of the 1260 years, seems to me altogether absurd.

2. If the saints were thus delivered into the hands of the Little Horn, how shall we account for the acknowledged fact that they knew nothing of the matter?

According to Mr. Mede's system, the saints were delivered over to their persecutor in the *fifth* century—according to Mr. Frere, Mr. Cuninghame, and Mr. Irving, in the *sixth* century—according to Mr. Faber, Dr. Hale, and many others, in the *seventh*—and according to

Bishop Newton and Lowman, in the *eighth*. It will appear less surprising that modern expositors should differ so widely as to the time when this most important event took place, if we consider that not one of "the saints" who lived in any one of those centuries ever dreamed that it had taken place at all. The church of God was delivered over to its persecutor, and yet for centuries knew nothing of the matter. "The Man of Sin," says Bishop Hurd, "had a *convenient time* to display himself and grow up." Yes truly—a convenient time for the Man of Sin, but a most inconvenient time for those expositors who are driven to such shifts to account for the lapse of these centuries; and a most awful time for those who formed the Christian Church during that period."

"The author of "A Defence of the Students of Prophecy, in answer to the Rev. Dr. Hamilton, of Strathblane," says—"Although several individuals testified against the Bishop of Rome as Antichrist, yet nothing decisive took place till the Reformation," [*that is for near a thousand years,*] "when it pleased the Lord to *open the eyes* of his servants, to see that Popery was the system which he had foretold as the Apostacy," &c. p. 53. Was it in ignorance, or in irony, that the Apostle directed the Thessalonians to look for the Apostacy *as the sign* of subsequent events? or were the Thessalonians, in the apostolic age, really gifted with a degree of penetration, which they had not the opportunity to exercise, but which was denied to millions in later ages, though it was the only thing that could have saved them from unpardonable sin and perdition?

Can any man say that he really believes, and seriously wishes us to believe, that when God had pronounced so heavy a curse on every one who should worship the beast, or receive his mark, he actually concealed from his church that most important fact, that the person or power whom they religiously believed to be their *spiritual* head, and the very Vicar of Christ upon earth—whom, under this view, they received with reverend honour and worship—whose mark they took upon them in simple faith that it was the seal of the living God—that this personage was indeed **THE BEAST**, the great enemy of their God and Saviour, whom they had been warned to resist even unto death?

To make the matter more tangible, I will speak of a period of three hundred years, comprising the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries; because I believe that almost all protestant commentators agree in supposing that “the saints” were, during that time, in the hands of the Little Horn. There were, therefore, saints in existence; and I would ask, *what did they do while they lived, and what became of them when they died?* If the prophecy is true, and rightly applied to the Papacy, then, *all* the saints who lived during those three centuries, either *refused* to receive the mark of the beast, and were slain by him (of which I find no re-

cord), or they *received* that mark and have passed into perdition.

We may try to get rid of the difficulty by vague talk about charity, or subtle distinctions; but I dare not alter the word of God, or make exceptions, qualifications, or conditions, where He has made none; and we may safely affirm the unsoundness of any system which requires such measures to support it. He has said—
“ *If any man worship the beast, and his image,*
“ *and receive his mark in his forehead, or in*
“ *his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of*
“ *the wrath of God, which is poured out with-*
“ *out mixture into the cup of his indignation;*
“ *and he shall be tormented with fire and brim-*
“ *stone, in the presence of the holy angels, and*
“ *in the presence of the Lamb: and the smoke*
“ *of their torment ascendeth up for ever and*
“ *ever: and they have no rest, day nor night,*
“ *who worship the beast and his image, and*
“ *whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.*”
It is also declared that “ *all who dwell upon the*
“ *earth shall worship him, whose names are not*
“ *written in the book of life of the Lamb slain*
“ *from the foundation of the world.*”—Rev.
xiii. 8.

If then any man shall choose to maintain that every individual of those whom he himself supposes to have been of the number of “the saints,” (I will not say in the world at large,

but even in the little world that has been made on purpose—the Roman-western-imperial-papal-habitable earth) during these three centuries, either worshipped the beast and has perished, or refused that worship and died a martyr, he may consistently maintain that the Papacy is the Little Horn; but I think he will not have many followers. Let him not, however, alter the word of God to meet the exigencies of his system; or tell a world, too ready to believe it, that how strictly soever the God of Heaven may denounce his wrath against any specified sin, we may yet charitably hope that he does not really mean all that he says.

3. The Pope does not appear to me to have answered the character of the Little Horn, as it regards *blasphemy*, any more than as it respects the particulars already mentioned.

To be sure, if we make free to explain away words, as we perhaps must, in order to maintain the system at all, it will not be difficult to make it appear that the Pope has fulfilled any prophecy that has ever been given. If we can really persuade ourselves that during nearly 1260 years the Pope has had the saints in his hands—has made war upon them, and worn them out—that he has caused “ALL” whose

names are not written in the book of life to worship him, and has literally, or figuratively, or mystically, or any how else, *slain* all the rest—if, I say, we can believe this, the path of interpretation is made wide and smooth enough. Nothing need stop us. We may always refer to such precedents; and if challenged by the common rules of interpretation, we may say—“We often find words thus used, or phrases which are to be explained on this plan, in other parts of scripture”—or, in other words, “We have taken the same liberties with plain words elsewhere so often, that however presumptuous or absurd we may be on this occasion, we shall not want a precedent.” Thus one departure from common sense not only produces a single error, but forms the support of many more. In fact, the various parts of this system appear to me to resemble a stand of grounded arms—each is actually falling with its own weight; but each supports, and is supported by, all the rest; and all derive, and communicate, that support by which they stand, from the very principle which, if they were single and independent, would bring all to the ground in a moment.

What is *blasphemy*? Mr. Faber has a note,^{*} which I consider as a literary curiosity. It is

^{*} Vol. I. p. 80.

to shew, in opposition to Mede and Sir Isaac Newton, that blasphemy, “does *not exclusively* “mean *idolatry*.” Why what man in his senses, that had not been blinded by system, would ever have dreamed that it did? Surely these great men must have thought that they might set common sense at defiance. Mr. Faber, however, after having shewn the fallacy of their interpretation, adds in round unqualified terms, “blasphemy is apostacy.” Is it? I conceive that this definition is no more correct than the other. Indeed it seems to me so obvious that a man may, like Saul of Tarsus, be a *blasphemer*, without being an *apostate*; and an *apostate*, like Demas, without being a *blasphemer*, that it would probably be a waste of words to say more about it. In fact, BLASPHEMY is a very intelligible word. “To blaspheme,” according to Johnson, is “to speak in terms of impious irreverence of God;” and such is the very conduct attributed to the Little Horn. He is to speak marvellous great words AGAINST *the God of Gods*—to shew himself in the temple of God that HE *is God*—to exalt himself *above all that is called God* and is worshipped—to force men to worship himself, or his image, on pain of death. All this is clearly enough “blasphemy,” in its plain and obvious meaning; and I am persuaded that but for the difficulty of making this square with the Papacy, we should have heard

nothing about either *idolatry* or *apostacy* as synonyms for *blasphemy*.

Here, as elsewhere, forasmuch as the Pope does not exactly suit the prophecy, we must so modify the prophecy as that it may suit the Pope. It is, however, curious to observe, that although commentators may have set out with saying that blasphemy means idolatry, or apostacy, or any thing else, yet they have uniformly felt the necessity of some attempt to make it out that the Pope has actually blasphemed, in the common sense of the word, and in modes somewhat resembling, or made to resemble, those predicted respecting the blaspheming of the Little Horn. In order to this, we are told that the Pope has, in a certain sense, or *virtually*, exalted himself above the Almighty by indulgences—or by others, who are not satisfied with this explanation, that the gods, above whom the man of sin should exalt himself are nothing more than earthly princes, and that instead of supposing “all that is worshipped” to mean all that is religiously adored, we should take it to mean the objects of that honour and respect which one man may lawfully shew to another. To help out, individual Popes are brought forward who have blasphemed, and individual writers who have blasphemed about the Pope. One writer after another has thought it to the purpose to state that some wretched

man was blasphemous enough to address his Holiness as "Our Lord God the Pope;" thus, with comical ingenuity, which would be out of countenance in any other argument, transferring the sin of blasphemy from him who uttered it, to him of whom it was spoken.

I have no wish to defend the foolish, blasphemous, and idolatrous impieties of Popery, but I must maintain that in this, as well as in other points, it either falls short, or does not agree, in kind and quality, with what we are led to expect from the Little Horn, whose blasphemy seems (if such a thing can be described in words) to be downright barefaced infidelity—something more like what was exhibited in France during the Revolution, than like any thing that has ever been seen in the Church of Rome. "He is Antichrist that *denieth* the "Father and the Son." The Church of Rome has not denied either; and if the open profession of faith in the Father and the Son, as very God, in glory equal, in majesty co-eternal, be the characteristic point, I shall be glad to be shewn any protestant church out of Great Britain and Ireland, so free from apostacy as the Church of Rome. This, however, belongs rather to the next division of the subject.

4. As the Papacy does not appear to have

† I. John ii. 22.

fulfilled the predictions respecting the Little Horn, so neither does it seem to bear the peculiar and characteristic marks of THE APOSTACY predicted in the scripture, and which, it is generally agreed, is described by the apostle Paul, II. Thess. 2, and I. Tim. iv. 1, &c.

I am not ignorant of the pains which have been taken to apply these passages to the Papacy, or of the learning and ingenuity with which that application has been maintained. The arguments in support of it have been so often stated, that they are probably familiar, or easily accessible, to every one who may take the trouble to read these pages. I shall, therefore, on the present occasion, merely state, as briefly as I can, the reasons which induce me to believe that Popery, notwithstanding its errors and its heresies—its idolatries, impieties, and cruelty, which I wish neither to deny nor to excuse, is not *the* apostacy against which the church has been forewarned. I very much doubt, indeed, whether the Church of Rome, corrupt as it may be, can properly be called *apostate*. That title seems to imply a more complete defection from the faith than is to be found in the Church of Rome, which has ever held the foundation, whatever wood, hay or stubble, it may have heaped upon it. I have

endeavoured to learn the doctrines of the Church of Rome, not from the explanations of Bossuet or Butler, but from her creeds and councils, and especially from the formularies, and tracts which she has circulated among her members; and though I have seen many of these, and have obtained some even in those parts where Popery is not merely established, but in its fullest vigour; yet I have scarcely seen any that did not contain a plain statement of the essential doctrines of Christianity. There has always been much alloy—often much absurdity—much that I believe to be error and heresy—yet, taking them altogether, as books to put into the hands of an uneducated person, they have generally contained better materials for forming a scriptural faith *on the fundamental points of Christianity*, than can be found in the neological divinity which has overrun almost all the protestant churches of Europe. Let me illustrate my meaning by referring to an author who will not be suspected of partiality to the Church of Rome. The translator of the catechism which was published on the restoration of Popery in France, after stating that it had been “ushered into the world in due form and order, and with all the sanction of authority, spiritual and temporal,” (that is, with the bull of the Pope, the mandate of the Archbishop of Paris, and the decree of the Emperor,) adds—“the

“doctrinal part of this catechism is as little exceptionable as any. The reader will here find the mere facts recorded in the sacred scripture, and the general principles of Christianity arising out of them, and depending upon them; and in these the Church of Rome is not unsound. The doctrine of the Trinity, the fall of man, original sin, the merits of Christ, the grace of the Holy Spirit, the eternal misery of the wicked, and the eternal blessedness of the righteous, have all a place in this compilation.”*

Now, though these doctrines may have much heaped upon them that shall perish, yet they are, I think, the foundation; and as long as the Church of Rome openly maintains them, I know not how to call her *apostate*, notwithstanding her many and great corruptions. She is, I imagine, and always has been, a part of the Catholic Church of Christ; and that she is viewed in this light by the Church of England, seems to be placed beyond all doubt, by the fact that a priest of the Romish Church, on his joining the Church of England, is not required to be re-ordained. It will be hard to account for this, without granting that the Bishop of

* A Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, translated from the Original, with an Introduction and Notes, by David Bogue. London, 1807.—
Introduct. p. vi.

Rome is a true Christian Bishop. It is difficult to imagine that the Church of England would admit a man to serve at her altar, because Antichrist had ordained him—because the “Son of Perdition” had laid hands on him—because the “Man of Sin” had given him holy orders. Should Mr. Irving conform, he must be received by our church as a layman. In vain might he plead that he had received ordination in the Kirk of Scotland, and had been acknowledged as a minister of a part of the Church of Christ—his case would differ essentially from that of Mr. M’Guire, who might claim at once the right hand of fellowship as a priest, simply on the ground that he had been a member of what these interpreters consider the great Antichristian Apostacy, and had been already made a Christian Priest by the Son of Perdition.

Suppose, however, that by some means or other, we can so qualify the word as to shew that the church of Rome is *an* apostacy, I must yet deny that it can be shewn to be *the* apostacy—or *such* an apostacy as we are directed to look for in the latter days.

I believe no writer of this age supposes that the Papal apostacy of the 1260 years began before the sixth century. Indeed all those systems which placed its commencement at an earlier period, may be said to have been refuted by time; because too long a period has already

elapsed since the æras on which they fixed. It is too notorious to be denied, that there were errors, and heresies, in the Church of Christ before that time; but it is maintained that before that time they *did not*, and from that time they *did*, constitute the predicted apostacy.

It appears to me that the predicted apostacy is described more particularly by three marks, and I presume that they were given to the church, in order that the faithful might know and avoid that apostacy, whenever it should take place, and testify against it after it had taken place. On these three points then, I will make a few observations.

1. The first mark mentioned by St. Paul is, that men shall “depart from the faith, “giving heed to seducing spirits, and *doctrines of devils.*”

That is, according to Mr. Mede, giving heed to doctrines of, or concerning, *devils*—or *dæmons*—or *inferior deities*—or *mediators* between God and man—or, in short, men shall depart from the faith, giving heed to false doctrines, which shall teach them to pay a superstitious and idolatrous veneration to departed saints, and angels, and to raise them to the rank of intercessors with God. And how is this wonderful transmutation effected, by which “devils” be-

come "saints and angels?"—Truly, by the help of heathen philosophy. A sad thing it seems to me, and one for which nothing but the exigency of system will account, that a christian priest, like Mede, should go to Plato and Plutarch to enquire what he was to understand by the word *δαιμονιον* in the writings of St. Paul. The simple question is, what sort of being did the Apostle mean us to understand by the word *δαιμονιον*? and what Plato might understand it to mean, or use it to express, is nothing to the purpose. It is no question of Greek criticism, but one purely theological; and one on which Mr. Mede, with the New Testament in his hand, was more competent to decide than all the heathen philosophers in the world. Plato said, indeed, as Mr. Mede has quoted, *Παν το δαιμονιον μεταξυ εστι Θεου τε και θνητου*. If we take his definition of a *dæmon*, why rest there? Why should we single out this word from the sentence? Is he not as competent to teach us what is meant by the Greek word *Θεος* as by the Greek word *Δαιμονιον*? Or have we any system of theology and *dæmonology* better than he possessed? Surely we have one, which should make us very shy of running to heathen mythology (or, as Mr. Mede more smoothly terms it, "the gentile's theology") for definitions on such subjects, even though they may help to support particular systems.

The word *Δαιμονιον* is common enough in the New Testament; and what is the invariable meaning of it as used by our Lord and his Apostles? I believe that there is no case in which they have used it, where it can be pretended that it means the separate, or deified, spirit of a man, or an angel, or any kind of being that could, by the utmost ingenuity, or perversion, be made to appear like a mediator between God and man. There is nothing that does in the slightest degree countenance the interpretation which Mr. Mede has laboriously fetched in from pagan superstition—nothing that allows us to believe that our Lord, or his Apostles, ever meant any thing by the word, but that which we understand by the terms “unclean spirit,” or “devil.”

“Perhaps,” says Mr. Mede, after having occupied five chapters with working round the matter, “I am yet too forward in my application; some things in our way must first be cleared; for howsoever the resemblance, indeed, be evident, yet, First, the text seems not to intend or mean it, because the word *Δαιμονιον* is in the scripture NEVER taken in the *better* or *indifferent* sense, howsoever profane authors do use it, but ALWAYS in an *evil* sense, for the *devil* or an *evil* spirit. Now, the signification of words in scripture is to be esteemed and taken only according to the

"scripture's use, though other writers use them
"otherwise."^a

One would suppose this to be unanswerable; but having made this broad assertion, Mr. Mede instantly undertakes to disprove it, by producing a passage in which the word is used in what he calls the "philosophical sense." In Acts xvii. 18, we read that St. Paul was charged with being "a setter forth of strange gods" (*δαίμονιον*). "This place," he adds triumphantly, "I take to be so unanswerable for the indifferent and common acceptation of the word *δαίμονιον*, that I care not now though the rest should fail me." In "the rest," indeed, he seems to have placed no great confidence, and that is not surprising when it is considered that they are, Rev. ix. 20, "that they should not worship devils," &c., and I. Cor. x. 20, "The things which the gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils and not to God; and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils."

Now with regard to the first of these, which is Mr. Mede's strong hold (Acts xviii. 18), he might have observed that the words on which he relies are the *quoted words* of heathen philosophers. I dare say that when "*they said*," he "*seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods*,"

^a P. 634.

they meant very much what Plato or Plutarch might have meant; but what is that to the purpose? I appeal to the reader, whether I might not as fairly argue that the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, does not always mean the true God, in the New Testament. After raking together all that could be found in "the Gentiles Theology," that could be made to resemble the scriptural account of the nature and attributes of God, (in which, by the way, there would be less difficulty than in making the pagan notions of $\delta\alpha\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$, agree with the scripture account of devils,) might I not triumphantly adduce Acts xxviii. 6? Who would venture to say that the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ in that place means the God of Abraham, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? Might I not adopt Mede's language, and say—"This place I take "to be so unanswerable for the indifferent and "common acceptation of the word $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, that I "care not though the rest should fail me?" But they would not. Acts xiv. 11, 12, would prove to a demonstration that the word was actually used for those beings who in "the "Gentiles Theology" were called Jupiter and Mercurius. The cases appear to me entirely parallel. The philosophers of Athens, the barbarians of Melita, and the men of Lystra, spoke according to their own conceptions; but to suppose that the inspired writer who recorded their words, meant to adopt their language, or

to countenance their notions, is monstrous; and surely no reasonable man, who was not driven to desperation by the exigency of system, would ever have thought of such a thing.

As to the argument drawn from Rev. ix. 13, it is merely begging the question, and requires no answer. *If* the prophecy has been fulfilled, and *if* the rest of the interpretation up to that point is right, we must make the best we can of that passage; and I acknowledge that it will be a mere trifle, in comparison with what we must have got over, by the time we arrive at it. But this is just the question.

With regard to I. Cor. x. 20, surely there is scarcely need to say any thing. It would have been most gratuitous to inform the Corinthians, that those things which the Gentiles sacrificed, they sacrificed to certain beings whom they called dæmons, and not to the true God. They knew that quite as well as the Apostle did, and his evident purpose was, *not* to speak of dæmons in the sense in which they used the word, but to shew them that the objects of Gentile idolatry were in fact what the word of God calls "devils." The reason which he assigns is sufficient evidence of this, and that he did not contemplate saints or angels, or any thing but unclean spirits—"I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils." According to Mr. Mede, St. Paul himself is now become one

of those very dæmons; and though I do not believe that any of our modern expositors of prophecy would join in a sacrifice to him, yet I doubt whether there is any one who would assign as a reason, that he was afraid of having, or seeming to have, "fellowship with the Apostle."

These passages are weak indeed, and less than nothing, when set against the constant use of the words in the New Testament, and the constant and plain doctrine of scripture.^b

Hitherto I have merely argued that there is nothing in the language of the prophecy—nothing in the declaration, that "in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils"—which points particularly at the doctrine, and practice, of the Church of Rome; and that the interpretation by which it is attempted to make it do so, is altogether untenable. Suppose, however, that interpretation should be granted—would it not render the prophecy nugatory with respect to the very object for which, it is admitted, it was given? Whatever "doctrines" the Apostle might refer to in speaking of the apostacy, we might naturally

^b It would be tedious to refer to all the passages; but let the reader who has any doubt refer to Matt. ix. 33, &c. x. 8, xi. 18, xii. 24, xvii. 18, Mark i. 34, iii. 15, 22, vi. 13, vii. 26, ix. 38, xvi. 8, Luke viii. 27, &c. xi. 14, &c.

expect (as indeed, I believe, all writers admit) should be characteristic of that apostacy—that is, should distinguish it from what the whole church had been before the rise of the apostacy, and from what the rest of the church should continue to be after the apostacy should have arisen. This doctrine, however, does neither one nor the other. No man, who has the slightest acquaintance with the history of the church, will deny that this heresy was far and wide established—was open, barefaced, and accredited, long before the period when the Papal apostacy is said to have taken place.* And is

* “ Read only some of the most celebrated fathers ; read
 “ the orations of Basil on the martyr Mamas, and on the
 “ forty martyrs ; read the orations of Ephraim Syrus, on
 “ the death of Basil, and on the forty martyrs, and on the
 “ praises of the holy martyrs ; read the orations of Gregory
 “ Nazianzen on Athanasius, and on Basil, and on Cyprian ;
 “ read the orations of Gregory Nyssen, on Ephraim Syrus,
 “ and on the martyr Theodorus, and on Meletius, Bishop
 “ of Antioch ; read the sixty-sixth and other homilies of
 “ Chrysostom ; read his oration on the martyrs of Egypt,
 “ and other orations : and you will be *greatly astonished* to
 “ find *how full they are of this sort of superstition, what*
 “ *powers and miracles are ascribed to the saints, what pray-*
 “ *ers and praises are offered up to them.* ALL THESE were
 “ monks, and most of them bishops too, in the FOURTH
 “ CENTURY.”—Vol. II. p. 467. These are the words of
 Bishop Newton ; and if the reader is not “ greatly asto-
 nished ” at facts which are pretty notorious, he may per-
 haps be surprised at finding them thus stated by a writer
 whose 1260 years did not begin till the *eighth century*.

there, or has there ever been, the slightest shade of real difference on this point between the Church of Rome, and the Greek Church? Has not the next greatest body of Christians to the Papists as many, and as unscriptural, doctrines of mediators, saints, and intercessors?

“It must be sadly acknowledged,” says Smith, “that there is a great deal of superstition mixed up in their public service, and offices: such is their perfuming the church, the painted figures, the holy table, the deacons and others with their incense-pots; their frequent crossing themselves; the extravagant respect they pay to the uncreated elements in the great procession; their closing several of their prayers with these words, ‘*for the intercession of our Lady, the spotless Virgin-Mother of God;*’ and sometimes they add, ‘*and of all saints;*’ the oblation of particles, and their prayers to *saints and especially to the B. Virgin, and the like*. After the offering up of the particle the quire sings, ‘*It is meet indeed to praise Thee, the Mother of God, who art always to be blessed, free from all blemish, the Mother of our God, more to be honoured than the cherubims, and beyond all comparison more glorious than the seraphims, who broughtest forth God the Word, without any diminution of thy virginity; we magnify Thee, who art truly the Mother of God.*’

“ They oftentimes make direct prayers to her ;
 “ as, ‘ *O, Mother of God, Holy above all, save us.*’
 “ When they are rising out of their beds in the
 “ morning they are taught to say, ‘ *Thou, O*
 “ *God, art holy, holy, holy: for the sake of the*
 “ *Mother of God have mercy upon us.*’ Besides,
 “ there are prayers and hymns directed to her
 “ in their offices, hence called *θεοτοκια*, full of
 “ extravagant expressions, and which argue a
 “ great declension from the purity and simpli-
 “ city of the Christian worship, too fulsome to
 “ be here recited at large ; only for a taste I
 “ shall add one or two. ‘ *In Thee, O Mother of*
 “ *God, have I put all my trust ; save me by thy in-*
 “ *tercession, and grant me pardon of my sins.*’ And,
 “ ‘ *O, blessed Mother of God, open to us the gate*
 “ *of thy mercy: let not us who hope in Thee, err ;*
 “ *but let us be delivered from dangers by Thee:*
 “ *for Thou art the safety of all Christians.*’ And
 “ the like horrible superstition they are guilty
 “ of in their addresses to angels and saints.”^d

I think it will be no easy matter to shew any real difference as to the doctrine of human mediators between the Church of Rome, and the forty millions of professed Christians who use the prayers of which the foregoing are “ a taste.” It marks the Church of Rome as apostate ; but fixes no such brand upon them.

^d Account of the Greek Church, p. 231.

The truth is, they are *not wanted*.^c We have already got a Western apostacy in Popery, and

* In this respect their circumstances very much resemble those of the Papists in America—who might, I should think, be considered as a part of the Papal apostacy. But they are not wanted, and would, indeed, only be in the way, and therefore, as far as I know, they are never brought into the question. That branch of the Romish church, founded in cruelty and blood, and maintained in the deepest superstition, may form a sort of city of refuge for the apostacy in the hour of God's judgments.

A strange thing it seems to me, that those who find in Daniel, and the Apocalypse, an anticipatory history of the world and of the church, should pass over an event so important as the discovery of America. Could I take their view of the subject, I should say, as Mr. Faber does of the Mohammedan delusion; "For myself I cannot readily imagine, that an event, pregnant" [if not] "with such great woe" [yet with such great and permanent consequences] "to sound religion, would be passed over in silence by the two great chronological prophets." Sac. Cal. I. 74. Surely, if, as Mr. Faber has said, "having various chronological prophecies which professedly relate to the entire period of the latter three times and a half, we may not unreasonably esteem them defective, if they be wholly silent as to the" French Revolution, we might also "not unreasonably" expect some notice of such an event as the spread and settlement of Christianity in a new-discovered world. Of this event we may surely say, with as much truth as he says of that, "This is a *naked historical* fact; whether the fact itself be or be not *foretold* in those prophecies which, as all acknowledge, treat of the latter three times and a half. As for the theological importance of the fact, the Christian, who values his religion, will not be disposed to controvert it: and with regard to the secu-

an Eastern apostacy in Mohammedanism, and to get another would spoil all. They may go on as they will—not having been allowed to be “saints,” because they *resisted* the Son of Perdition and are separate from his communion, they may practise his characteristic sin as boldly as he does, without incurring the guilt, or the judgments, of the apostacy.

2. Forbidding to marry—of this characteristic mark of the apostacy much the same may be said. That there were heretical sects in the church which prohibited marriage long before the period when it is pretended that the apostacy took place, will not be denied; and even if we lower down the terms of the prophecy so as to meet that spirit which gave rise to and cherished monachism, that spirit and the practice to which it gave rise formed no part of Popery contemplated as the apostacy. “Till the year

“lar importance of the fact, it will be as little disputed by “the mere politician, whether he be, or be not, a speculative believer in the truth of revelation.” Sac. Cal. I. 74. But no expositor—not even those who have found the invention of air balloons, or the fact of Mr. Faber’s preaching in St. Paul’s, Covent Garden, predicted in the chronological prophecies—has, as far as I know, ever met with any allusion to the extension of the Christian Church, or of the Papal apostacy in a new world—but America would only add fresh embarrassment to a system already overloaded with difficulties.

“ 250, there were no monks, but only asceticks
 “ in the church: from that time to the reign of
 “ Constantine, monachism was confined to the
 “ anchorets living in private cells in the wilder-
 “ ness: but when Pachomius had erected mo-
 “ nasteries in Egypt, other countries presently
 “ followed the example, and so the monastic
 “ life came to its *full maturity* in the church.”^f

But let us restrict the prophecy still farther, and confine it to the forbidding one class of persons of one sex to marry, for special reasons arising (or, however erroneously, supposed to arise) out of their function. The Church of Rome forbids her priests to marry—no doubt she does, and so did the Catholic Church long enough before the Papal Apostacy began. To say nothing of earlier custom, or more private injunction or recommendation, “ the Council of
 “ Eliberis in Spain,” says Bishop Newton,
 “ which was held in the year of Christ 305,
 “ was, I think, the first that by *public authority*
 “ forbade the clergy to marry, and commanded
 “ even those who were married to abstain alto-
 “ gether from their wives.”^g I am not going

^f Bingham’s Antiquities, Vol. III. p. 7.

^g Vol. II. p. 465. I give the Bishop’s own statement; but I have some doubt, whether the construction which he, and other writers, have put upon the canon to which he refers is correct. If it is not, I do not want to take advantage of their error, and I think it right to state my suspicion. I will transcribe the canon, however, and the reader may

about to maintain the infallibility of councils, or to defend the constrained celibacy of the Romish clergy; I merely state that the forbidding to marry, of which the Church of Rome is guilty, did not originate in that church, and does not distinguish it from the Catholic Church before the supposed apostacy.

Neither does it, so far as I can see, very materially distinguish it from the Greek Church; in which "marriage does not hinder any per-

judge for himself. "Placuit in totum prohibere Episcopis, "Presbyteris, Diaconibus, et Subdiaconibus positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis, et non generare filios. Quod quicumque fecerit, ab honore clericatus ex-terminetur." I think this may possibly have been intended to forbid the withdrawal of married ecclesiastics from their wives; especially because, notwithstanding the Bishop's assertion (which after some practice in turning out his authorities has no great weight with me), I cannot find that this council did prohibit the marriage of ecclesiastics, if by this canon it "commanded even those who were married to abstain altogether from their wives;" and also because a subsequent canon (65) seems to contemplate the clergy as living in a married state. "Si cujus clerici uxor fuerit mœchata, et sciat eam maritus suus mœchari, et eam non statim projecerit, nec in fine accipiat communionem: ne ab his, qui exemplum bonæ conversationis esse debent, videantur magisteria scelerum procedere." I suggest this merely as a doubt which I do not think it right to suppress. If the Bishop is correct, the marriage of the clergy was prohibited even earlier than I suppose; if he is not, it makes very little difference as to the time, and none at all as to my argument.

“ son, if he be not otherwise unqualified, from
 “ being put into holy orders; nor is such a one
 “ obliged to live from his wife. But the gene-
 “ ral practice of the church is against marriage
 “ after orders. So that if any priest, once
 “ married, should marry a second time, much
 “ more, if a priest not before married should
 “ enter into this state, they are liable to cen-
 “ sures; and as if the character imprinted upon
 “ them, when they were made priests, were by
 “ this act rased out, they are esteemed as mere
 “ Laicks, and accounted Παράνομοι or flagitious
 “ persons, and transgressors of the laws and
 “ canons of the church.” ^h

I do not believe that a law, or custom, or practice, which requires a great qualification or restriction of the words of the prophecy— which originated out of the Romish Church— which was in full vigour before it is pretended that the apostacy of that church took place— which in fact is not peculiar to that church— was intended as a characteristic mark of the Romish Church.

3. “ Commanding to abstain from meats.”
 I feel quite at a loss how to express my astonishment, that any expositor should have been hardy enough to carry on the interpretation by

^h Smith on the Greek Church, p. 91.

applying this part of the prophecy to the fasts of the Church of Rome. Strange indeed it will be if the predicted mark of apostacy should turn out to be a practice commanded in the word of God, recognized as a religious duty by every christian communion, and placed first and foremost in her list of "good works" by the purest protestant church in the world.¹ To say that *this*, which the Church of England enjoins on her members, as a "good work, " whose commendation is both in the law and " in the gospel," changes its character so far as to become a badge of apostacy, when excessively or superstitiously performed, is a shift which it would not be worth while to answer, if the reply were not so close at hand. Has the Church of Rome ever commanded such excessive abstinence as had been practised by voluntary superstition long before that church was distinguished as the apostacy, or, in fact, distinguished at all from the rest of the Catholic Church? And has the Greek Church never been excessive or superstitious on this point? " The first great and holy fast, as they speak, " is that before Easter, according to the ancient " practice and example, and takes up full *eight* " *and forty days*, besides the Sundays: all which " time (unless upon the festival of the Annunci-

¹ See the Homily " Of Good Works. And first of Fasting."

“ ation of the Blessed Virgin, and Sundays,
 “ when they are indulged to eat some sort of
 “ fish, which they may not upon other days of
 “ Lent) they wholly abstain from all sorts of
 “ flesh, and fish too, except shell fish, as
 “ cockles, muscles, oysters, scallops, and such
 “ as have no blood (for of these they may law-
 “ fully eat); as also from eggs, cheese, and
 “ whatsoever is made of milk; and use them-
 “ selves for the most part to a dry kind of diet.
 “ On Sundays and Saturdays the use of wine
 “ and oil is permitted; but the devouter sort
 “ of people, and especially the priests, and they
 “ of the monkish order, refuse both. Some
 “ are so strangely devout, or rather supersti-
 “ tious, that they will not touch any thing that
 “ is forbidden; so that if by chance a drop of
 “ wine or oil should fall upon their bread, or
 “ any of their lawful food, they think them pol-
 “ luted and profaned, and accordingly throw
 “ them away; and had rather (out of obstinacy
 “ and desperateness) perish, either through
 “ hunger or by sickness, than be guilty of so
 “ grievous a sin, as they esteem it.”^k — — —
 “ The second solemn fast is of *forty days*, be-
 “ ginning on the fifteenth day of November,
 “ and serves to usher in the solemnity of
 “ Christmas.” — — — “ This fast is very mild

^k Smith on the Greek Church, p. 35, et seq.

“ and easy, in comparison of the great Lenten
 “ Fast before Easter; for though they are
 “ obliged to abstain from flesh, butter, eggs,
 “ &c. yet there is free use of oil, wine, and all
 “ sorts of fish, as at other times. The third
 “ solemn fast is in honour of the B. Virgin, and
 “ called by her name. It lasts *fourteen days*.”

— — — “ The fourth solemn fast is the fast
 “ of the Holy Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul.
 “ The duration of this fast is not fixed and cer-
 “ tain, as the rest are; for it is longer or shorter,
 “ as Easter falls higher or lower in the year.”
 The author adds, however, that in the year
 1669, when he obtained his information, it ex-
 tended to *twenty-two days*. “ Thus much for
 “ the annual fasts. The weekly fasting days
 “ are Wednesday and Friday; which are
 “ strictly still retained, in compliance with the
 “ ancient custom and practice of the Catholic
 “ Churches in the first ages of Christianity.”

Are these marks which the scripture sets be-
 fore us characteristic of the Papacy? I appeal
 to the reader, whether they distinguish the
 Church of Rome, as it has been in that period
 during which it may be called the Papacy,
 from what the Catholic Church was before that
 time, and what the Greek Church has been
 ever since?

There is much parading of witnesses, who, it
 is pretended, even in ages of darkness and igno-

rance, saw clearly, and proclaimed boldly, that the Pope was Antichrist—is it pretended that these are the points against which they testified. I have already exposed some part of the falsehood, by which these men of straw have been palmed upon ignorant, or careless, readers; and I cannot help wondering that those who spared neither pains, nor principle, to bring witnesses, did not manage to make the testimony which they put in their mouths rather more to the purpose. What restrained those who had the effrontery to affirm, that St. Bernard believed, and taught, that the Pope was Antichrist, from asserting that he denounced the invocation of saints, and the adoration of the Virgin?—that he caused all the monks of Clairvaux to marry, and forbade them to abstain from meats, to the great solace of the said monks, their wives and little ones, and to the utter confusion of the detected apostacy?

On this point I speak, because I feel, strongly; and it is a source of grief and indignation to see how passages are misquoted, and made to say what their authors never meant. I do not, however, by any means, cast the guilt of this on the writers of the present day. The *authorities* on which their systems are founded were, for the most part, collected long ago by men less honest than I verily believe them to be, and I really think that not one of them would have

recourse to the dishonest artifices which Bishop Hurd and Bishop Newton did not think it beneath them to employ.¹

It may be asked—If the Papacy has not fulfilled these predictions, *how* have they been fulfilled? I answer, that it seems to me most plain and obvious, that they have never been fulfilled at all. I imagine that whenever the “saints” shall be actually in the hands of the Little Horn, they will be in no doubt whether they are there or not. I fully believe that the prophecy will be fulfilled, in all its parts; but, while I consider it as still unfulfilled, I am not prepared to describe the mode of its accomplishment. I think, however, that the plain language of the scripture warrants us to expect,

1. A *real* apostacy, openly denying the truth of Christianity;—openly and avowedly denying the Father and the Son.
2. That this apostacy shall be headed by some person who shall impiously claim divine honours, and exact them on pain of death.

¹ This is a heavy charge, and I would not make it without adducing some proof of its truth; but as that would only interrupt the course of the present argument, to which it has not any restricted application, and as it is, moreover, a point of some importance, as affecting the confidence which may be placed in those who have been considered as leading expositors of prophecy, I prefer adding it in the form of a separate section.

- 3 That this apostate power shall have dominion over "the saints" (whatever persons may be intended by that title), and shall institute, and successfully carry on, a persecution by which they shall be "worn out."
4. That the same apostate power shall forbid to marry.—Those who have any acquaintance with the real doctrines of apostates from Christianity, (whether French philosophers, German illuminati, or liberal infidels of England), will require no proof that such a law may be expected, if an infidel apostacy should become dominant. If others doubt on this point, I had rather that they should remain unconvinced, than bring forward matter which might convince them. They who are not "liberal" and "enlightened philosophers" themselves, and who have not taken pains to see through those who are, have, I believe, very little idea of what is going on in this day, and in this country, to prepare the community for such a measure. I may say, however, that I believe three years have not elapsed, since one of our most notorious political economists is reported to have publicly denounced the institution of marriage, as one of three great evils, to which the misery of mankind might be attributed.

5. That this apostacy should also issue some ordinance commanding to abstain from meats. What this may be, I know not; but that it should be religious fasting, professedly in honour of the true God, I do not expect.

These, and not these only, seem to be predicted marks of the apostacy. Whether I am right, however, in this brief statement of them is of no importance to our present question; which, I must remind the reader, is not whether the prophecy may be hereafter fulfilled in this, or in that, way, but whether it *has been* already fulfilled in the Papacy? For my own part, I fear that while people have busied themselves in fitting these prophecies to the Papacy, they have almost overlooked a real apostacy which, under the names of rationalism and neology, has risen to a fearful height in foreign Protestant churches, to say nothing, at present, of any other.^m

^m Let the reader, who is in any doubt on this subject, read Mr. Rose's Sermons, and the publications to which they have given rise—especially, (as that which most clearly and unanswerably shews the state of the church in Germany,) Bretschneider's Reply, translated by Mr. Evanson. There is something, which, if the matter were less serious, would be very amusing, in the wrath which has been excited among the divines of Germany, and in their various modes of expressing it. Many have done valiantly; some, perhaps, whose answers I have not seen, wisely; but of what I have

But, as I have already said, our present question is simply, whether the prediction has seen I do most affect the cool, brief, and pithy revenge of the Herr Prediger Schoene, who has stuck our English divine into his chronological tables, published at Berlin in 1828. There he stands, with as much distinction, and as fair a chance for immortality, as if he had been a Pope or an Emperor—a comet, or a general council—and Bur-schen yet unborn may sigh (or, more probably, swear) as they read—"1826. Hug. Jac. Rose, Cantabrig. a zelotus, "instructus et subornatus, in theologos Germaniæ eruditissimos intemperanter ac proterve debacchatur." Some excellent observations, on the subject of "Favourable Notices and Reviews of Infidel Publications," have appeared while these sheets were passing through the press, in the tenth number of the *Christian Review*, which may shew the reader what I mean by expressing a fear that the infection was not confined to foreign churches. When English critics, (I know not to whom the *Christian Reviewer* alludes,) come to talk of the "defective and even "erroneous theological creed" of Gesenius, there is some fear, that either they are not qualified to review his writings, or that they have adopted his theological creed, as far as he can be said to have any. This is not the way in which his neighbours speak of the Professor. I recollect the cool, matter-of-course manner in which a bookseller, in Halle, who heard me expressing my disgust that a man who had just published a most infidel book should continue to be Professor of Divinity in another University, observed—"Why, our Gesenius believes nothing of the matter!" I know not who was the writer of the *Antichristian* or the *Christian review* to which I have referred—but to the latter I would take leave to suggest that "one gentle hint" is not enough, with respect to an evil, which should the Church of England continue to exist (a thing not impossible—but, per-

been fulfilled in the Papacy; and the reader will remember that my object in bringing for-

haps, more to be desired than expected), will, if not openly and vigorously resisted, reduce her to a level with those churches, which have scarcely even a form of godliness remaining.

Long as this note is, I cannot help adding a specimen for the benefit of those readers who are not familiar with the subject. As our present business is with the Apocalypse it shall be, from what I believe to be, the latest Commentary on that book which has issued from the German school. The author is Professor Ewald, of Gottingen, and the book was printed at Leipsic, 1828. Even a short extract may, perhaps, be enough to give the reader, unaccustomed to this school of divinity, quite a new idea of the nature of the Revelation itself, of the object for which it was written, of the views and principles of the writer, and of the mode in which it should be treated by an enlightened theologian. The first section is "De scribendi consilio librique argumento;" and after speaking of the trials which the primitive Christians were called to endure, the Professor adds—

"Igitur ne nimis Christiani tantis periculis detererentur
 "neve plures, ut jam coeperunt, timore a fide christiana
 "alieni facti detrimentum inferrent rei christianae summum,
 "solandi erant miseri et erigendi, vituperandi timidi et
 "impii, monstrandum erat, mala utut maxime videantur
 "terribilia, brevi tamen cessatura esse; piis et fidelibus
 "ampla virtutis et fidei nunquam infractae praemia, ceteris
 "autem qui aut Christianorum sacra timore ignaviave de-
 "serant aut ipsi Christianos immerito vexent, poenas certo
 "instare gravissimas.

"Quo autem facilius coaevos suos calamitatum istarum
 "onere pressos partim consolando erigerit et firmaret, partim
 "minando hortaretur et instigaret, succurrit Johanni *idea*
 "*quaedam tam temporis orbi christiano familiarissima, quae*
 "*omnium animos tenuit, firmavit et exercuit, ideam dico de*

ward the question was only to shew *one* of the many difficulties which arise out of the mystical

“ *παρρησια χριστου*. Viguit scilicet opinio christianorum
 “ animis alte infixæ, christianam rem, qualis primis initiis
 “ erat, tenuem, pressam et contemptam non diu mansuram ;
 “ laetiori potius, qua digna sit, sorte mox eam fore ornandam. Haec tamen idea sic expressa cum hominum animos minus percellat et moveat, cum alia conjungebatur
 “ cui major inerat vis ad veritatem illam imaginum ope
 “ rudioribus quoque persuadendam. *Sumta ea est ex opinionibus de Messia judaicis, ad Christianam tamen indolem sapienter temperatis*. Notum est, Judaeos imprimis post
 “ vaticinia *sub Danielis nomine* celebrata Messiam melioris
 “ conditionis instauratorem, pios et fidos beantem impios
 “ punientem, eo ipso tempore adventurum esse credidisse,
 “ quo pii gravissime hostibus externis oppressi sint ; quæ
 “ cum opinione conjuncta erat arctissime de Messia Hierosolymis hostium vi deletis regni melioris seu coelestis instauratore et omnium, mortuorum etiam facta pro meritis remunerante persuasio. *Pulcherrima est hæc temporis melioris futuri, quod omnes cupimus et semper cupimus, imago, modo ne singulos colores poetis et vatibus debere obliviscamur*. Illam vero Messiae imaginem cum Jesus in
 “ terra non exprimeret, ipsi discipuli ex eo mox abitu
 “ quæsierunt, quando vere ut talis Judæorum Messias
 “ adventurus sit Matth. 24, 3. Nec Jesus quæ prius jam
 “ vates de Messia augurati erant omittit ; Messiam docet
 “ celeriter et improvise, ubi pii maximis periculis confecturi sint, coelitus adventurum et judicium habiturum esse,
 “ id autem ante omnia urget, tempus adventus quamvis
 “ proximi prorsus esse incertum, piis igitur semper esse
 “ vigilandum et pro viribus laborandum ne præmio excident Matth. 24. 25. Quibus orationibus quid Jesus aliud
 “ potuit spectare, nisi ut spe ista, rem christianam aliquid
 “ quando felicem fore, assecclas suos ad fidem et virtutem

interpretation of the 1260 days. To go through all the difficulties of that system, and to sift all

“maximas inter calamitates inconcussam servandam hortaretur? (Matth. 24, 36-25, 30). Et quam sapienter tempus adventus non definivit, ut semper Christianis vigilandum esse doceret?”

“Opinio haec de Christo mox redeunte quantum valuerit in orbis christiani primordiis, omnes N. T. epistolae satis demonstrant. Ea apostoli ut consolabantur miseros, ita impiis minabantur (1 Cor. 16, 22); Christum cum mox pro merito omnibus retributurum et impios imprimis puni- turum esse quis putaret, tanto ardore Christi praecepta tenere et contentis humanis (Tac. Ann. 15, 44) omnibus atque caducis futura meliora soli virtuti studentes sperare solebant, ut nisi haec opinio alte animis eorum infixafuisset, nunquam doctrinam christianam tam mirifice propagari et sustentari potuisse credas. Cumque persuasio haec iniquissimis Christianorum primorum temporibus firmissima fuisset et *utilissima* (ut semper in maximis, quas immerito subimus, calamitatibus plurimum opus est spei), postea inde a fine saeculi secundi et tertii cum laetioribus et tutioribus rei christianae incrementis prorsus evanuit vel explicatione (si vera fateri licet) *falsa* ita immutata est, ut jam Christi adventum post immensam demum et nemini cognitam seculorum seriem expectandum esse putarent.

“Hac igitur communi temporum istorum opinione utitur etiam felicissime auctor Apocalypseos, cujus summum argumentum hoc est, ut Christianos tum temporis maximis malis oppressos et a gentiliū furore coeco vexatos adventu Christi vindicis pios remunerantis, impios, gentiles imprimis punientis vivide describendo consoletur et ne metu fidem deserant adhortetur minis immixtis.”

May we not believe that the disciples of this Professor will be prepared to join those who shall ask, “where is the promise of his coming?”

the hard sayings which must be received before we can embrace it, would weary both myself and my readers; because they must for the most part be treated of separately and in detail. Of this, however, I shall give a specimen, in some remarks on the common interpretation of the seven heads of the beast; but, for the sake of clearness, I shall throw them into a separate section.

In the mean time I beg the reader to weigh the points already adduced in this section, viz. the unprecedented nature of the required interpretation—its having been totally unknown to the Church of God, who were most deeply interested in it, from the days of Daniel to those of Wickliffe—the total inability of expositors, even when they assumed the period, to make any thing of it in which they can agree among themselves—the actual want of real conviction, and faith in *these* fulfilments of prophecy, which is found in the Christian Church—the absence of appeal to *them* in controversy with infidels—and the difficulties which must be got over with respect to historical facts,—and I ask, whether these matters, impartially considered, do not form a strong body of *direct evidence* against the mystical interpretation of the 1260 days?

NOTE ON BISHOP NEWTON.

In justification of what I have already said respecting Bishop Newton, I wish to bring before the notice of the reader two specimens of what I consider as dishonest artifice. They are not all that might be adduced, but they are perhaps sufficient; and I feel it a duty to promote an examination of the *authorities* on which the system of the 1260 years rests, because, as I have already said, they were collected by writers less scrupulous than I believe the present race of expositors to be, who nevertheless use the authorities collected by their predecessors, without sufficient examination. The authorities quoted by Bishop Newton are particularly liable to be used in this way, because, in all editions that I have seen, the original of all passages quoted, is printed at full length in the notes, and seems to give a sort of security for correctness. That it is not so, may however appear from the following instance. The Bishop says—

“ Sulpicius Severus having given an account of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, and of all the particulars relating to

“ it, subjoins an exposition of it agreeable to Daniel’s interpretation. ‘ The image is an emblem of the world. The golden head is the empire of the Chaldeans : forasmuch as that was the first and most wealthy. The breast and arms of silver signify the second kingdom : for Cyrus, the Chaldeans and Medes being overcome, transferred the empire to the Persians. In the brazen belly, the third kingdom is declared to be portended ; and that we see fulfilled : forasmuch as the empire taken from the Persians Alexander vindicated to Macedonia. The iron legs are the fourth kingdom : and that is the Roman, the strongest of all the kingdoms before it. But the feet, part of iron and part of clay, prefigure the Roman empire to be so divided as that it should never unite again : which is equally fulfilled — — forasmuch as the Roman territory is occupied by foreign nations or rebels : and we see (saith he, and he lived at the beginning of the fifth century) barbarous nations mixed with our armies, cities, and provinces. But in the stone cut out without hands, which brake in pieces the gold, the silver, the brass, the iron, and the clay, we have a figure of Christ. For he shall reduce this world, in which are the kingdoms of the earth, to nothing ; and shall establish another everlasting kingdom. Of which alone the faith of some is still dubious, and they will not credit future things, when they are convinced of the past.’ ”

Of this quotation the original is given in a note ; but with what fairness the reader who compares it with what was actually written by Sulpicius Severus, may judge. I subjoin for that purpose the whole passage, placing between brackets and in italics those parts which the Bishop has omitted.

“ Igitur secundum prophetæ interpretationem, imago visa,
 “ figuram mundi gerit. Caput aureum, Chaldæorum impe-
 “ rium est : siquidem id primum et opulentissimum fuisse
 “ accepimus. Pectus et brachia argentea, secundum reg-
 “ num annunciant. Cyrus enim victis Chaldæis atque
 “ Medis, imperium ad Persas contulit. In ventre æreo,
 “ tertium regnum portendi pronuntiatur : idque impletum
 “ videmus. Siquidem Alexander ereptum Persis impe-
 “ rium, Macedoniæ vindicavit. Crura ferrea, imperium
 “ quartum, idque Romanum intelligitur, omnibus ante reg-
 “ nis validissimum. Pedes vero partim ferrei, partim fic-
 “ tiles, dividendum esse Romanum regnum, ita ut nunquam
 “ inter se coeat, præfigurant : quod æque impletum est.
 “ Siquidem [*jam non ab uno Imperatore, sed etiam a pluri-*
 “ *bus, semperque inter se armis aut studiis dissentientibus, res*
 “ *Romana administratur. Denique commisceri testum atque*
 “ *ferrum nunquam inter se coëuntem materiam : commistiones*
 “ *humani generis, futuræ a se invicem dissidentes, significan-*
 “ *tur. Siquidem*] Romanum solum ab exteris gentibus, aut
 “ rebellibus occupatum, [*aut dedentibus semper pacis specie*
 “ *traditum constat :*] exercitibusque nostris, urbibus atque
 “ provinciis permixtas barbaras nationes [*et præcipue Ju-*
 “ *deos, inter nos degere, nec tamen in mores nostros transire*]
 “ videamus. [*Atque hæc esse postrema tempora prophetæ*
 “ *annunciant.*] In lapide vero sine manibus abscisso, qui
 “ aurum, argentum, et ferrum testumque comminuit, Christi
 “ figuram esse. Is enim [*non conditione humana editus (si-*
 “ *quidem non ex voluntate viri, sed ex Deo natus est)*] mun-
 “ dum istum, in quo sunt regna terrarum, in nihilum rediget
 “ regnumque aliud incorruptum [*atque perpetuum, id est*
 “ *futurum in seculum, quod sanctis paratum est,*] confirmabit.
 “ De quo uno adhuc quorundam fides in ambiguo est : non
 “ credendum de futuris, cum de præteritis convincantur.”

Now, would not any reader, who learned the
 opinions of Sulpicius Severus only from Bishop

Newton's quotation, suppose that he thought he saw the predicted *division* of the Roman empire, in "the barbarous nations mixed" with the older inhabitants of the Roman empire? Would it not bring to his mind—and was it not meant to bring to his mind—the hostile irruptions of barbarians, and "the division" of the Roman empire among them? And is not the hint that he "lived in the beginning of the fifth century,"^a artfully dropped for the same purpose?

On the contrary, taking the whole passage as it really stands, it appears that Sulpicius Severus considered himself as living in the last days; and believed that he *had seen* the division of the empire predicted by Daniel, not in the multitude of foreigners (principally Jews) who came to settle in it, but in a fact which the Bishop has totally sunk, and which he did not believe to have any thing to do with the prophecy—namely, the government of the Roman empire by more than one Emperor.^o

^a This is true as to the letter. The Bishop refers to Cave, but does *not* give his words, which are, "Claruit anno 401."—*Hist. Lit.* I. 284. Dupin says that he "lived till towards the year 420."—*Eccl. Writers*, III. p. 112.

^o There is another reason why Bishop Newton could not recognize this fact as operating any division of the Roman empire, or any change in its constitution, and why it was better to pass it over altogether. It would make another head of the beast, as Whiston contends that it did.

I do not pretend to say that the whole guilt of this fraud must be charged on Bishop Newton; though, as he gives no other reference than to the original author, he has certainly made himself responsible for the fairness, and accuracy, of the quotation. Still, he may have taken it, without due examination, from the work of some earlier writer; and this is the more probable, because I believe that those who knew him best did not give him credit for much more than a compilation.^p Be this, however, as it may, I trust that by noticing such specimens of garbled and perverted quotations as I have already brought forward in this, and my former, Enquiry (and which might be easily multiplied) I may prevail upon some readers—perhaps on some writers—to examine the authorities which are cited by writers on the 1260 years. I do not say that a writer is always bound to collate a quotation, before he adopts it; for that may be impossible: he may not know, therefore, whether it is correctly cited or not; but he must always know where he got it; and I can imagine no reason, but vanity or carelessness, which should prevent his telling the reader.

^p “DR. ADAMS. I believe his ‘Dissertations on the ‘Prophecies’ is his great work.”

“JOHNSON. Why, sir, it is *Tom’s* great work; but “how far it is great, or how much of it is *Tom’s*, are other “questions. I fancy a considerable part of it was borrowed.”—*Boswell’s Life of Johnson*, vol. V. p. 166.

I proceed to notice what appears to me to be a very disingenuous method of slipping over a difficulty.

In the twelfth chapter of the Revelation we read—

13. And when the dragon saw that he was cast unto the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the man-child.
14. And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place: where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.
15. And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.
16. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed up the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth.
17. And the dragon was wrath with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Commenting on this passage, the Bishop says—

" When the dragon was thus deposed from the imperial throne, and *cast unto the earth*, (ver. 13,) he still continued to persecute the church with equal malice, though not with equal power. He made several attempts to restore the pagan idolatry in the reign of Constantine, and afterwards in the reign of Julian; he traduced and abused the Christian religion by such writers as Hierocles, Libanius, Eunapius, and

“ others of the same stamp and character; he rent
 “ and troubled the church with heresies and schisms;
 “ he stirred up the favourers of the Arians, and espe-
 “ cially the Kings of the Vandals in Africa, to perse-
 “ cute and destroy the orthodox Christians. These
 “ things, as Eusebius saith upon one of these occasions,
 “ some malicious and wicked dæmon, envying the
 “ prosperity of the church, effected. But the church
 “ was still under the protection of the empire, (ver. 14)
 “ *and to the woman was given two wings of a great eagle.*
 “ As God said to the children of Israel, (Exod. xix.
 “ 4,) *Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and*
 “ *how I bare you on eagle’s wings, and brought you unto*
 “ *myself*; so the church was supported and carried as
 “ it were on eagle’s wings: but the similitude is the
 “ more proper in this case, an *eagle* being the Roman
 “ ensign, and the *two wings* alluding probably to the
 “ division that was then made of the eastern and the
 “ western empire. In this manner was the church
 “ protected, and these wings were given *that she might*
 “ *fly into the wilderness*, into a place of retirement and
 “ security, *from the face of the serpent*. Not that she
 “ fled into the wilderness at this time, but several years
 “ afterwards; and there she is nourished for a time,
 “ times, and half a time, that is three prophetic years
 “ and a half, which is the same period with the *thousand*
 “ *two hundred and threescore days*, or years before
 “ mentioned. So long the church is to remain in a
 “ desolate and afflicted state, during the reign of Anti-
 “ christ; as Elijah (I. Kings xvii. xviii., Luke iv. 25,
 “ 26,) while idolatry and famine prevailed in Israel,
 “ was secretly fed and nourished three years and six
 “ months in the wilderness. But before the woman
 “ fled into the wilderness, *the serpent cast out of his*
 “ *mouth water as a flood*, (v. 15,) with intent to wash
 “ her away. *Waters* in the style of the Apocalypse

“(c. xvii. 16) signify *peoples* and *nations*; so that
“ here was a great inundation of various nations, &c.”

The woman, according to the interpretation just quoted, did not fly into the wilderness at the time when the wings were given to her, “ but *several years* afterwards.” I suspect that comparatively few readers are aware of the period which they are carried over by this phrase. How long a space of time may we fairly speak of as “several years?” Shall we say five, ten, fifteen, or twenty? or shall we be more liberal, and say fifty? or, if system requires, make quite free, and take sixty, eighty, or a hundred? Surely the most lax defender of the Bishop could not plead for greater latitude. I ask, then, is it not *positively dishonest* to use such a phrase, to slip over a period of more than three hundred years, which, according to the Bishop’s system, elapsed between the woman’s receiving these wings, and the earliest period from which he thought it possible that her abode in the wilderness could be dated?

How Bishop Newton makes it out that the woman *did* use these wings in the eighth century, when as he supposes she took up her abode in the wilderness—or what the divided empire had to do with it—or why that is mentioned, except to suit the chronology, and to give an idea of some sort of fulfilment by the Roman *eagles*—I do not understand, and can

not conceive. Stilicho had passed away, and the "inundation of various nations, whom he is said to have invited, had been" swallowed up by the Romans long enough before that time. But that is provided for by slightly altering the prophecy. St. John says, "the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood, *after* the woman;" the Bishop says, "*before* the woman fled into the wilderness, the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood, (ver. 15,) with intent to wash her away."

This, however, is not the precise point. I adduce the passage as an instance of slipping over a difficulty, and to put careless readers of Bishop Newton's Dissertations, on their guard.

REMARKS
ON THE COMMON INTERPRETATION
OF THE
SEVEN HEADS OF THE BEAST.

“The seven heads are seven mountains on which the
“woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five
“are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet
“come.”—Rev. xvii. 9, 10.

I was led to make the following remarks on the heads of the beast by the fifth argument of Mede; but I have thrown them into a separate form, because they would have interrupted the course of my reply to that writer's proofs, to which indeed they have no particular application. Whether the sixth head had fallen more than a century ago, is a point which I venture not to decide, when I see such persons as Mr. Mede and Mr. Faber diametrically opposed; but the more I have considered the interpretation which finds in the seven heads of the beast, just seven forms of Roman government, the more I have been dissatisfied with it; and the

grounds of my dissatisfaction I wish to submit to the public. I am induced to do this, because I am convinced that many readers, and some writers, have no idea of the difficulties which exist on points that are very often slightly and cursorily passed over; and which are treated as if they might be taken for granted. I would premise, however, that I object to the common interpretation simply on the ground that it is *in itself* unsatisfactory; and that I am not trying to get rid of it in order to maintain any scheme of my own; for though I feel very confident that the seven heads are not seven forms of Roman government, as they have hitherto been enumerated, yet I am altogether unable to say what they are. I cannot, however, think that, in such a case, it is our duty to let what is bad stand untouched, until we are prepared to set up something better. The first duty is to pull down what is unsound; and it is better to let the foundation which God has laid lie bare and level with the ground, until, in answer to our prayers and our labours, he shall enable us to build up something solid and substantial, than to heap up hay and stubble, in order that we may seem to have done something. If the current interpretation of the seven heads is well founded, whatever I may say will not much shake it: if it is not, the sooner it is disbelieved the better; in

order that we may not be prevented from searching for the truth, or led to reject it, from a mistaken idea that we possess it already.

Let us, then, see what is the current exposition. Mr. Frere, speaking of the seven heads, says, "the first six of these are, on the most " satisfactory historical evidence, *universally* admitted to have been Kings, Consuls, Dictators Decemvirs, Military Tribunes, and Emperors."¹ I cannot help wishing that, on points which almost preclude the possibility of certain knowledge, writers would use more measured language. I do not believe that Mr. Frere meant to say what was false; but certainly he stated what it is scarcely possible that he should know to be true. I think I have a list of nearly three hundred works on Daniel and the Revelation, and for any thing that I (or, perhaps, Mr. Frere) can tell, there may be three hundred more; and it would surprise me almost as much to find that Mr. Frere had read them all, as it would to learn that they were unanimous on any one point relating to the 1260 years. I say this with no wish to censure Mr. Frere; but because I see that one expositor after another copies these broad, unqualified, assertions, without examination; and thus error acquires the stability, from having assumed the

¹ Pref. p. ix.

confidence, of truth. I have considerable doubt whether it can be fairly said of *any* interpretation of *any* symbol in Daniel or the Apocalypse, that it is *universally* admitted; certainly it cannot be said of this one.[†]

I shall not therefore have to bear the charge of disputing what is *universally* admitted, if I proceed to enquire, how far this opinion is well grounded. Whether the "historical evidence" which may be adduced is "most satisfactory," the reader will judge; for my own part, I believe that the interpretation rests on no historical evidence at all; but was merely adopted, at first, to meet the exigency of the case; and to answer this question, "If the Beast is the Roman Empire, what *can* the seven heads be?"

I have already professed my inability to answer this question; but I must say that the current answer is to me most unsatisfactory; whether it will appear so to the reader, does, I apprehend, depend very much upon the light in which he considers it. If he views it as an exposition of the word of God, and simply confers the facts of history, with the statement of the Revelation, he will, I think, be altogether dis-

[†] How many expositors may have opposed this interpretation I cannot pretend to say; but I am sure that I might add more names to those of Bullinger, Junius, Langius, Michaelis, Herder, Cocceius, Vitringa, Storr, Eichorn, Grotius, Hammond, Hardy, and Whiston.

satisfied with the degree of correspondence which he will find between them; if, on the other hand, he considers it simply as a part of a system, the rest of which he takes for granted, and therefore makes up his mind that this *must* be so, because it is necessary to the system, he may believe this as firmly as he does the rest. I do not pretend to say that it is more difficult of belief than some part, or other, of every exposition that I have seen of the Revelation, on the system of the 1260 years.

In the first place I would observe, that this interpretation is founded on the assumption that the seven *Kings* (ch. xvii. v. 10) are not seven *Kings*, nor even seven *Kingdoms*, but seven forms of government in one and the same state. Now the passage before us is not a *description* of symbols, but professedly an *explanation* of symbols. It is the *interpretation* of the angel; and every other word in it is taken literally by almost every writer whose works I have seen. The seven *Kings* are spoken of, not as symbols, but as things symbolized; and I know not where we are to stop, if we thus find one figure within another. Why are these *Kings* to be figurative, while the mountains where they reign, and the peoples whom they govern, are literal? Surely this looks like an

* As if to balance this matter, the *Kings* are the only part of the sixth seal which most commentators understand lite-

accommodation to system, and suggests a doubt of the system which requires it. But not to insist upon this, let us enquire how the heads of the beast are made out in the Roman empire. I think we must suppose, either that the beast had all his heads *at once*, or else that he had them *in succession*. The latter idea is, I believe, generally adopted by expositors. Thus, Archdeacon Woodhouse says, "can we trace " back the forms of government which *succeeded* " *each other* under the Roman domination, so " that they may fairly appear five, preceding " the imperial form?" (p. 431.) Mr. Mede says, " the heads of the beast are to be conceived as " *climbing one above another*." (p. 596.) " By " the seven heads are meant so many forms of " government which took place *successively* in " the Roman empire." (Gill, Comm. in l.) " The heads signify seven forms of government, " or *successions* of rulers." (Scott, Comm. in l.)

By such statements as these, I apprehend that the reader who is not familiar with Roman history is led to imagine, that the specified

rally. See Rev. vi. 15, where we find " the Kings of the " earth,"—" that is," says Bishop Newton, " Maximian, " Galerius, Maximin, Maxentius, Licinius, &c." on a symbolical earth, with figurative mountains and islands, under a symbolical heaven with a figurative sun, moon, and stars, and suffering from a figurative earthquake. I have read more of homogeneity than I understand.

forms of government actually followed each other, like a succession of monarchs or dynasties; and such an idea would perhaps be even more strongly suggested by the language of some other expositors. Thus Mr. Gauntlett says—"The wild beast, therefore, namely the "Roman empire, was to have no more than "seven heads, or so many forms of government, "although, as far as *chronological succession* is "concerned, it shall be under the domination "of eight." (p. 293). Dr. Hales says, "His "seven crowned heads are described as seven "Kings, or forms of Government. 'Five of "them had fallen' at Rome in its pagan state—"1, *Kings*, beginning B. C. 753; 2, *Consuls*, "B. C. 509; 3, *Dictators*, B. C. 497; 4, *Decemviri*, B. C. 451; 5, *Consular Tribunes*, "B. C. 444, and were succeeded by the sixth, "the Imperial, B. C. 30."—(Anal. vol. II. part ii. p. 1355.)

I do not mean to charge these writers with intentional misrepresentation; but I think it will be evident that their statements are calculated to convey a very erroneous impression. Surely a person who had not read, or did not recollect, the Roman History, would suppose that they were speaking of seven consecutive forms of government, succeeding each other, in chronological order, in the same manner as George the Second, succeeded George the

First, and has been succeeded by George the Third, and the Fourth. After so much talk of *succession*, and such a representation of the heads of the beast *climbing* over one another, and falling one after another, surely he would not think the "historical evidence most satisfactory," if it represented the second head as in existence after the fourth head had been cut off; and found that, though it was mentioned as a peculiar distinction of one head, that it should receive a deadly wound and yet revive, nothing was in fact more common than for a head to be in and out of existence repeatedly in the course of a few years.

Let us see what were the facts of Roman History on this point. Chronological minutiae have nothing to do with the question, and therefore I will take the dates as they stand in Hooke's Roman History.

A. U. C. 243. **KINGS** expelled, and the name and office abolished—or, perhaps, only suspended for about a thousand years, if, according to Bishop Newton's suggestion, we prefer making Odoacer's assumption of the title of *King of Italy*, "a re-
"novation of the kingly authori-
"ty," to an admission that it was
"a new form of government dis-

“ tinct from the Imperial.” How-
ever this may be, the office and
title of King was abolished, “ the
“ administration,” says Hooke,
“ was reduced to an *interregnum*,
“ and the people, by another vote,
“ declared Lucretius

A. U. C. 243. “ INTERREX.” While the supreme
power was in his hands, either he
was a head of the beast, (though
certainly neither of the specified
heads), or the beast had no head
at all; and this is equally true of
all subsequent periods when the
government was in the hands of
an *Interrex*, who was always,
from the very circumstances of
the case, possessed of supreme
authority.”

¹ Vol. III. 302.

“ “ Si quando proditus Interrex munus pro quo dicebatur,
“ exequi nequiret, exacto dierum quinque spatio, alius suc-
“ cederet, qui vices ausciperet donec per singulos in orbem
“ irent, ut modo tertius, nunc quintus, aut quartus, nonnun-
“ quam quartusdecimus, plerumque vigesimus proditus In-
“ terrex consules, magistratusve faceret aut comitia haberet.
“ Quos quidem Interreges dum honori præerant consulum
“ vicem gerere, idemque juris et potestates habere haud
“ dubium est donec absoluto Reipub: munere Interregum
“ potestas finiretur.”—Alexander ab Alexandro Gen. Dier.
Lib. V. c. 6.

- A. U. C. 244. CONSULS created—or the beast began to exist under what is commonly called his *second* head.
253. DICTATOR appointed—or the *third* head began to exist. What became of the *second* head? Had it fallen, or had it not? As far as history is concerned, it seems to me that something might be said on both sides, as it regards the Consulship.* The Consular office was not abolished, nor did

* When I see it seriously maintained—notwithstanding what plain readers of history have been used to consider its “Decline and Fall,” its overthrow and extinction—that the Roman empire remained, and was governed by *bona fide* successors of Augustus until the year 1806, I cannot help thinking that it is somewhat inconsistent to consider the Consular Head as altogether passed away before the time of St. John. I am not going to insist on its revival in the First Consul of France, though I take leave to throw out the hint, for the benefit of any writer whose system it may suit; but I venture to ask the reader, whether there is not more colour for asserting that the Consulship survived the time of St. John, than for maintaining that the Emperors remained in existence, *as one head*, from the time of Augustus to A. D. 1806? Might not some writer, whose system required it, tell us that although at a period much later than that of St. John, there was a nominal Emperor, who had usurped on the liberties of the Roman people, yet the Consular office and dignity was scrupulously maintained, and even declared by a Roman historian of high authority

the individuals cease to be Consuls, though the Consular power ceased to be supreme. However, it is not my place to settle this matter. If the Consular head did not fall, the beast had two heads at once; if it did fall, it speedily revived, and was the only living head of the beast—for we find

A. U. C. 256. CONSULS restored to the supreme authority.

257. DICTATOR Posthumus—or third head alive again.

258. CONSULS, again.

259. DICTATOR Valerius.

to be the “*summa potestas*.”^a That a much later writer^b had called it “*summum bonum, primumque in mundo deus*,” and that, in short, (to adopt the words of a historian who could not be supposed to have in view any hypothesis for the interpretation of prophecy) “it was still felt and acknowledged, in the *last period* of Roman servitude, that this empty name might be compared, and even preferred, to the possession of substantial power. The title of CONSUL was still the *most splendid object of ambition*, the noblest reward of virtue and loyalty. The *Emperors themselves*, who disdained the faint shadow of the Republic, were conscious that they acquired an additional splendour and majesty, as often as they assumed the annual honours of the Consular dignity.”—Gibbon’s Dec. and Fall, II. 29.

^a Sueton. in Calig. p. 424. ^b Jornandes de Rebus Geticis, cap. lvii.

A. U. C. 259. CONSULS, again.

270. INTERREX. A. Sempronius followed in that office by S. Lartius.

271. CONSULS restored. Was this head slain by the interregnum, supposing it not to have fallen by repeated Dictatorships? or did the Consular head exist when there were no Consuls?

295. DICTATOR, Q. Cincinnatus.

— CONSULS.

302. DECEMVIRI appointed—or *fourth* head began to exist.

304. CONSULS,

308. MILITARY TRIBUNES—or *fifth* head began to exist.

— CONSULS again.

Here is a specimen of less than seventy years. It would be tiresome, and surely it is needless, to pursue the shifting forms of the Roman government; for he who is not convinced by this specimen, of the unfitness of a beast with seven *successive* heads, to symbolize such an empire; or of the impropriety of representing these heads as consecutive; would be as little moved by a detail of the subsequent alternations of Consuls, Military Tribunes, Dictators, and those periods when none of them existed. To myself it appears not only unwarranted, but

absurd, to conceive of the heads as thus rising and falling, and to suppose that the beast had sometimes one head, sometimes two, sometimes none at all, and sometimes one or more of the old ones revived.

I apprehend that there are only two ways by which we can fairly enumerate the forms of Roman government; that is to say, either by *changes of official title* in those who held the supreme power, (in which case we shall find too many,) or by *substantial changes of the Constitution*, of which we shall not find enough for our purpose. Still, I know of no other way by which we can reckon; and I beg the candour and patience of the reader while I make a few remarks on these.

The former method appears to have been adopted by most writers. Mr. Faber says, “ although the Austrian Archduke ceased to be
“ the representative of the last head, because he
“ formally abdicated the *official title* of Roman
“ Emperor, Napoleon did not become the re-
“ presentative of that head, *because* he never
“ assumed the *official title* in question.” Vol. III. 10. Mr. Cuninghame says, “ It merits our
“ most attentive consideration that until the
“ renunciation of the *Imperial Titles* of Rome by
“ Austria, *rendered* Napoleon the virtual repre-
“ sentative of the Cæsars, his enterprises on the
“ Continent of Europe were crowned with

“ complete success, but now he occupied the throne of the beast,” &c. p. 310.

On this plan, then, what are we to do with the INTERREX, whom we so frequently find possessed of the supreme power in the Roman state? The *official title* of *Emperor* was not more formally abdicated by the Austrian Archduke, than the *official title* of King was formally abolished by the Romans. Now, I hope I shall not give offence to the learned reader (if I am so honoured as to have any), by supposing that some other person, into whose hands this Enquiry may fall, may say, “ Who ever heard of an Interrex? and who would think of putting him among Kings and Consuls and Emperors?” I answer—he was as great a man—was, as truly, the supreme head of the government—and was, as completely, distinguished by his own peculiar *official title* as any one of them—and if he had been wanted to make up the number, or could have been admitted without prejudice, you certainly would have heard of him—but tell me honestly, whether the titles of Decemviri, Dictators, and Military Tribunes, are not better known to you from books written on prophecy, than from the Roman history itself? And might not something like this be suggested respecting Odoacer, and Genseric, and Alaric—of the Exarch of Ravenna and the Kingdom of the Heruli?

But, not to pursue these questions at present, I readily admit, that, as far as I know, the Interrex has always been excluded from the list of heads; and this, I presume, for the obvious reason, that he would make one too many. I can imagine no other reason why he should not be admitted; and of the consequences arising from it, I intend to speak presently.

In the mean time, let me ask what relation Fabius Maximus bore to the state when he was *PRODICTATOR*?¹ There seems to me to be no pretence for saying that he was a *Consul*, and special care was taken in his appointment not to make him a *Dictator*. If, however, it be said, that though he never had, or pretended to have, and was specially and carefully excluded from, the *official title*, yet he was in fact neither more nor less than a Dictator, I shall thankfully accept the concession, and hope to have an early opportunity of using it; but on our present plan it gives no help, because we are reckoning by the official titles of those who held the supreme power. Whether the Prodictator can be said to have done this might admit of some question; because a Consul co-existed, whose power did not merge, as it would have done in a Dictatorship. This, however, makes no difference as to the argument; for undoubt-

¹ Livy, xxii. 8.

edly the supreme power was either in the Prodictator, or in him and the Consul jointly; and either way we shall not find such a head in the list which we are examining.

Should any one say, “*minus insignis quia non “diuturna, mutatio fuit,”*” I answer freely that I agree with him; as I do also with Livy, who used those words to express his opinion of the *Decemvirate*.²

Again—was the Roman empire never governed by a TRIUMVIRATE? I anxiously desire to be concise, and I feel that it is enough simply to allude to this notorious part of the Roman History, and to ask, if the Triumvirates did not form a head of the beast, what head had he during their existence?

What shall we say of PERPETUAL DICTATORS? Perhaps it will scarcely be safe to reply that the *perpetuity* of their office did not distinguish them from common Dictators.

Might not something too be said of the SENATE? I think, if it were wanted, we might find some way of shewing that it was, at some time or other, possessed of supreme authority; and might dismiss all gainsayers to dispute the matter with Otho, who has satisfactorily decided the point, by expressly and emphatically (though unconsciously, and without any know-

² Lib. III. c. 33.

ledge of the prophecy) calling it "CAPUT
"IMPERII."^a

It is obvious, however, that we have already got beyond the prescribed number of "official titles;" and yet I can anticipate no reasonable or consistent objection to those which I have proposed to add to the list. Let them, however, be all rejected, and the difficulty still remains, and is equally fatal to the system. If these persons were not heads, during their official existence, surely it cannot be pretended that the beast had any head at those periods at all; and if he was without a head for one hour, he must have become, on Mr. Faber's principle, totally extinct. "Symbolical decorum," says that writer, "which is founded upon physical realities, forbids us to ascribe vitality to the hieroglyphical hydra when not a single one of his seven heads is in existence."^b "The excision or deadly wound of any single head must prove mortal to the whole beast; unless *previous to*, or at the *precise time* of, the excision, he puts forth (like the fabled hydra) another head."^c "We may safely assert," he adds, when speaking of the seventh head, (and I suppose it is equally true of all the others,) "that the seventh head must rise up either *shortly before* the fall of the sixth, or *in*

^a Tac. Hist. Lib. I. c. 84.

^b Vol. III. p. 17.

^c Vol. III. p. 27.

“ *the very moment* of its fall, because otherwise
 “ our interpretation will exhibit the hierogly-
 “ phical solecism of a wild beast continuing to
 “ live, though in a headless state; a thing im-
 “ possible in nature, and therefore equally
 “ impossible in a symbol, which is professedly
 “ constructed upon the œconomy of nature.”^a
 What is implied in this statement, is roundly
 asserted by Mr. Gauntlett. “ NOT A DAY can
 “ be mentioned,” says that writer, “for more
 “ than seven hundred and fifty-two years be-
 “ fore the birth of Christ, to the 18th June,
 “ 1815, on which a head of the Roman empire
 “ did not exist under one of the forms symbo-
 “ lized by the seven-headed apocalyptic beast,
 “ described in this chapter.”—(2d Ed. p. 306.)

Such an assertion would have amazed me, if
 it had been the first time that I had found the
 facts of history mistated, by writers on the
 1260 years. As it is, however, I am used to it,
 and can take it coolly. I am quite sure that
 Mr. Gauntlett did not mean to say what was
 untrue; and that this is the case with too many
 writers on the subject, in the present day, who

^a Vol. III. p. 22. In this the reader will probably agree
 with Mr. Faber: but it seems to give a hard blow to his
 own system, which requires him to maintain that while the
 beast lay dead he put forth a new horn. See vol. I. 192.
 If such a thing be not “ impossible in nature,” it is at least
 something very much out of the common way.

still do, in fact, perpetuate error, and publish most glaring falsehood. I believe they are too apt to take things on trust from their predecessors, without examining for themselves; and thus, what was stated carefully, and, perhaps, with some latent exclusion, by the first writer, is copied by a second without observing some nicety of phraseology; or, perhaps, with some alteration of his own *to make it clearer*—a third takes it as he finds it, but, perhaps, abridges or compresses it into a more dogmatic form—it gathers strength in progress, and soon passes from hand to hand as current truth.

It is my duty, however, to state, that not only “a day,” but a period of *several consecutive years*, may be mentioned, in which there was not in the Roman Empire either King, Consul, Dictator, Decemvir, Military Tribune, Emperor, Pope, Interrex, Prodictator, or Triumvirate, or any living creature, that either Mr. Gauntlett or any one else, as far as I know, has ever suspected of being a head of the beast. Now, if during this “*solitudo magistratuum*,” as Livy calls it,* which lasted *four or five years*,

* Livy says, “*per quinquennium urbem tenuit.*” Lib. vi. 35. Eutropius says, “*quadrennium ita fluxit ut potestates ibi majores non essent.*” Lib. II. iii. “An anarchy,” says Ferguson, “of five years (from U. C. 377 to U. C. 382) ensued, during which time the republic, *bereft of all its officers*, had no magistracy besides the Tribunes of the

and in which there was *no* head in existence, the beast did not die, what could kill it? and may I not ask, in Mede's words, "how shall we ever know when it is dead for adoe?" To be sure, if it got over this, it might well survive lesser periods of suspended animation; such as, when "after the death of Jovian, the throne of the Roman world remained ten days without a master."¹ It is not needful, therefore, to refer to such cases; but I would seriously ask the reader, whether it is not high time to examine a system of interpretation which requires such an arbitrary selection of facts, and such an inconsistent application of principles.

Surely, we cannot fairly make out the fallen forms of Roman government to have been five, if we count by *official titles*; let us consider what would be the effect of counting by *substantial changes* of constitution.

As far as I can understand the History of the Roman Empire up to the time of St. John, it was simply this—a *Monarchy* existed until the people rose and destroyed it—a *Republic* was then formed, which existed, under various modifications, for several centuries; during which it tended generally, and gradually (if I mistake not, I might say, naturally) to a Democracy in

"people, who were not legally vested with *any degree of executive power.*"

¹ Gibbon, II. 483.

theory, and an Aristocracy in practice, until at length Monarchy was restored. How to make more changes, without descending to such minor variations of constitution as would make too many, I know not; and I believe the thing is impossible.

I am at a loss to conceive how the *Monarchy* of the *Emperors* can be said to differ essentially from that of the *Kings*. In fact, mere historians, who have no system to support, see no substantial difference between a King, a Dictator, and an Emperor. Thus, the author of the Universal History says, "In short, the *Dictatorship* was a kind of *absolute monarchy*, though "not durable;"² and again, "as the *regal power* "was revived in the *Dictator*, he was allowed to "create a chief officer in the army, under the "name of *Magister Equitum*, that is, Master or "General of the Horse, which answered to the "office of the *Tribunus Celerum* in the time of "the *Kings*." Vol. XI. p. 385. Hooke says of the Dictatorship, "This new kind of government erected at Rome might be called an *ab-*

² Should this want of durability appear to create a difference the reader will remember that the Emperor (or, more properly speaking, PRINCEPS—only then we should get another head where we have too many already) was originally but a temporary office. Were it otherwise, the *Perpetual Dictator* would remove all difficulty with regard to Emperors, as he now does with respect to Kings.

“*solute monarchy* in a republic, though not “durable.” (Vol. I. 163.) And, in fact, whatever change there might be in official title, what *real* difference was there? Niebuhr says, “The “most important record of this period is the “introduction of the Dictatorship, of which “Rome derived both the name and office from “the Latins. Monarchy was necessarily and “universally the first form of government. The “Latin cities appear to have merely modified “it to an elective power, and the Roman Dictatorship also *was the undiminished regal authority.*” Vol. I. p. 376.

If the Dictator was so much like a *King*, how is he to be distinguished from an *Emperor*? the resemblance, or rather identity, was obvious enough to a mere historian; “*Neque quid-* “*quid,*” says Eutropius to the Emperor, “*si-* “*milius potest dici quam dictatura antiqua,* “*huic imperii potestati quam nunc tranquillitas* “*vestra habet.*” I. xii.

Thus far I had written before I was aware that Mr. Faber had published any work, on the prophecies supposed to relate to a period of 1260 years, since that one which I have hitherto quoted. I have now seen his Sacred Calendar of Prophecy, and as he expresses a wish that it should supersede his former publication, it would be unfair to represent him as holding any opinion which this work disavows, or im-

pliedly retracts. I am not aware, however, that I have done so; and, in fact, my references to his work, in this Enquiry, have been by no means with a view to produce any peculiarities, by which his system is distinguished from those of other writers, who hold the same fundamental doctrine of the existence of a period of 1260 years. I have been accused of putting forth Mr. Faber as the “single representative” of prophetic commentators: it certainly was not my intention, and I should have thought that any person who had read my former Enquiry, could not suspect me of thinking that any one writer on the 1260 years could be taken as a representative of the rest. If I have referred to Mr. Faber more frequently than to other writers in this Enquiry, it is for this simple reason—that a great part of it was written in a country where English books are extremely scarce, and where, though I was able to borrow the work of Mr. Faber in the capital, I could get no other English writer on prophecy, and I believe the whole kingdom could not have furnished one.

On the point now in question, however, Mr. Faber has changed his opinion, and proposes a plan, by which (if we can persuade ourselves to adopt it) we may certainly get over some great difficulties.

He says—“The apostle teaches us, by the

“ declaration of the interpreting angel, that, in
“ his time, one of these heads was in actual
“ existence, that five had antecedently fallen,
“ and that another was yet future.

“ Now, in the time of the apostle the Roman
“ Emperorship was the polity in actual exist-
“ ence. Hence we may be certain that the
“ Roman Emperorship is the head which the
“ apostle characterises by the words *one is*, and
“ which history teaches us to have been then
“ the supreme form of Roman government.

“ But the apostle further declares, that five
“ other heads had antecedently fallen.

“ Here, in comparing his declaration with
“ the testimony of history, we are encountered
“ by an apparent difficulty: for St. John states
“ that only *five* heads had fallen; but history,
“ upon the first inspection of it, seems to inti-
“ mate that *six* supreme forms of Roman go-
“ vernment had become extinct. These six
“ are enumerated by Tacitus as the Kingship,
“ the Consulate, the Dictatorship, the Decem-
“ virate, the Military Tribunate, and the Tri-
“ umvirate:” and, after he has enumerated
them, he remarks, that “ the second Triumvi-
“ rate terminated in the sole rule of Augustus,
“ who, with the title of *Prince*, reduced all
“ things under the Emperorship. Thus it
“ might seem that, according to St. John’s
“ statement, *five* heads only had fallen when

“ the Emperorship was established : while, according both to the accurate specification of Tacitus, and to absolute matter of fact, *six* forms of supreme government had already at that period become extinct.” ^h

Mr. Faber then goes on to establish the claim of at least the second Triumvirate to be considered as a head of the beast, and adds—

“ How, then, it will be asked, are we to reconcile the statement in the Apocalypse with the voice of history ?

“ To this question I reply, that the difference is apparent, not real. Mr. Mede, and those who have followed him, omitting the Triumvirate, make the Kingship one of those five heads, which in the time of the apostle had *fallen*, or had *become extinct*. But, in truth, the Kingly head, so far from having *fallen*, had then, after a sleep or quiescence of several centuries, recently *awaked* in the full vigour of renewed action.”

I apprehend that this solution of the difficulty will astonish most readers ; and until I find that it has been more generally adopted than I can suppose that it ever will be, I do not feel myself called upon to do more than merely to mention it. It certainly had not occurred to me, that the heads might have all the

^h Sac. Cal. III. 125.

convenience, without the prejudice, of extinction, by going to sleep.

Mr. Faber, however, adds, in confirmation of his opinion;—

“ It is not unworthy of note, that the singularly accurate language of the Apocalypse perfectly accords with the present arrangement.

“ *Five Kings have fallen, and ONE is.* The interpreting angel does not say; *five Kings have fallen, and THE SIXTH is*; for, had *such* been his phraseology, he would have required us to pronounce, in plain opposition to historical testimony, that the Roman Emperor-ship was the *sixth* head of the wild beast. But he says; *Five Kings have fallen, and ONE is*; a mode of expression, which precisely corresponds with literal matter of fact: for, though five had fallen, the then existing King was the *first*, not the *sixth*. As the angel speaks, *ONE is*; not *the SIXTH is*.”

To this it may be sufficient to oppose the plain language of the interpreting angel—
“ There are seven Kings: *five* are fallen, and *one* is; and *the other* is *not yet* come.” Rev. xvii. 10. If this does not imply that the *one* that *is*, is the *sixth*, I think we may give up attempting to understand what language does mean, and confess that there are no limits to what it may be made to mean.

I am glad, however, to find Mr. Faber contending for two points for which I have argued, but which have hitherto been very commonly denied by expositors. First, that the Kingship and Emperorship cannot fairly be considered as distinct heads; and, secondly, that the Triumvirate has as much claim to be reckoned a head of Roman government, as any other form which ever existed. Whoever doubts on these points may find much to satisfy him in the part of Mr. Faber's work to which I have referred.

For the reasons which I have assigned, it seems to me quite impossible that the common interpretation of the seven heads of the Beast, should be the true one. As I have already stated, I believe that it was merely devised to meet the exigency of the case, and to answer the question, "If the Beast is the Roman Empire, what *can* the seven heads be?"—If it be now retorted on me, "Well, and what *can* they be, if they are not these forms of government?" I must answer, "I do not know."

Quis pudor, illud

NESCIO honoratum constanti promere voce

Quom sit opus? Malo hoc, quam dici *nescit*;—

though certainly not for the reason assigned by the satyrists; for when I see what interpretations are received by the public, with decorous gravity, I should not fear "turpes audire ca-

“ chinnoſ,” however ingenious I might be. But, in fact, I am unable to offer any explanation of this mysterious paſſage. I incline to follow Langius¹ in the opinion that the angel did not refer to the time preſent, when he was ſpeaking to St. John; but to the future period, foreſhewn in the viſion. If, to explain my meaning, I may be allowed to paraphraſe the words of the angel, I would ſay, “ The Beaſt before you “ is characterized by having, or having had, “ ſeven heads—but at the period during which “ he is now ſhewn to you (that is, when the “ woman is drunk with the blood of the ſaints, “ ver. 6, and the time of her judgment draws “ on, ver. 1), five of thoſe heads are fallen.” This I am inclined to think, but this I pretend not to DEMONSTRATE. I am fully ſenſible, that he who merely oppoſes a ſystem, has a leſs pleaſing, and leſs dignified, taſk, than he who frames one; and whenever God ſhall enable me to explain any part of his word, I ſhall eſteem it a high honour, and a cauſe for deep gratitude. In the mean time, while I take not upon

¹ “ Quid autem ſibi velit *quinarius* illorum, qui ceciderunt, *numerus*, fateor, me nulla poſſe conjectura aſſequi, “ nec mihi placere ſententiam illorum qui, hæc ad quintuplicem regiminis Romani antiquiſſimi formam, diverſo “ etiam modo, referunt. Johannes quidem utitur præterito, “ *ceciderunt*, ſed ſenſu prophetico de futuro.” *Langii Gloria Chriſti*, p. 203.

me to be an architect, I am thankful to be employed as a surveyor; and to exercise the humble—but not useless—office of pointing out the unsoundness of buildings, which I might not have had the talent to conceive, or to erect.

1. The first part of the document is a list of the names of the persons who were present at the meeting.





1

1



